

BR
C559

CHURCH HISTORY

VOL. I

MARCH, 1932

No. 1

PERMANENT DEPOSITS OF SECTIONALISM
IN AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY

By Abdel Ross Wentz

MEDICINE FOR SIN AS PRESCRIBED
IN THE PENITENTIALS

By John T. McNeill

THE ANABAPTISTS, THE REFORMERS
AND THE CIVIL GOVERNMENT

By Harold H. Schaff

Published by

The American Society of Church History

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, 1888: REORGANIZED, 1906: INCORPORATED BY ACT OF THE
LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916

OFFICERS FOR 1932

WILLIAM WARREN SWEET	President
CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN	Vice President
FREDERICK WILLIAM LOETSCHER	Secretary
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS	Treasurer
MATTHEW SPINKA	Assistant Secretary

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

HENRY JACOB WEBER	WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON
SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE	EDWARD STRONG WORCESTER
WILLIAM WALKER ROCKWELL	WILLIAM DAVID SCHERMERHORN
GEORGE WARREN RICHARDS	JOHN THOMAS McNEILL
JAMES MOFFAT	

EDITORIAL BOARD OF CHURCH HISTORY

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
WILLIAM WARREN SWEET, *ex officio*

PUBLICATION OFFICE, SCOTTDALE, PENNSYLVANIA

EXECUTIVE AND EDITORIAL OFFICE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

CHURCH HISTORY is a quarterly journal published in March, June, September, December by the American Society of Church History. The subscription price is Three Dollars per year. The price of single copies is seventy-five cents. To foreign countries, the postage of twenty-five cents a year must be added. Subscriptions should be sent to Church History, 610-614 Walnut Ave., Scottdale, Pa., or to Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, 10 Nelson Street, Auburn, New York. Remittances should be made to the order of American Society of Church History.

All communications regarding contributions, book reviews, and other matters of editorial nature should be sent to Professor Matthew Spinka, 5757 University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

Claims for missing numbers and changes of address should be addressed to Church History, Scottdale, Pennsylvania.

Application for entry as second-class matter pending.

Consp. Sec.
Wilson
9-19-35

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, *Managing Editor*
ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS
WILLIAM WARREN SWEET, *ex officio*

VOL. I

MARCH, 1932

No. 1

CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF POLICY	2
PERMANENT DEPOSITS OF SECTIONALISM IN AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY	
By <i>Abdel Ross Wentz</i> , Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania	3
MEDICINE FOR SIN AS PRESCRIBED IN THE PENITENTIALS	
By <i>John T. McNeill</i> , Divinity School of the University of Chicago	14
THE ANABAPTISTS, THE REFORMERS, AND THE CIVIL GOVERNMENT	
By <i>Harold H. Schaff</i> , Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.	27
AMONG THE MEMBERS	47
IN MEMORIAM	49
BOOK REVIEWS	51
CASE, S. J., ed.: <i>A Bibliographical Guide to the History of Christianity</i>	
<i>Abdel Ross Wentz</i>	
PAUCK, WILHELM: <i>Karl Barth</i>	H. Richard Niebuhr
HYMA, ALBERT: <i>The Youth of Erasmus</i>	Wilhelm Pauck
SWEET, W. W., ed.: <i>Religion on the American Frontier:</i>	
<i>The Baptists</i>	R. E. E. Harkness
GARRISON, W. E.: <i>Religion Follows the Frontier</i>	W. W. Sweet
ROWE, H. K.: <i>History of the Christian People</i> . Robert Hastings Nichols	
HAYWARD, F.: <i>A History of the Popes</i>	John T. McNeill
VEREILL, A. HYATT: <i>The Inquisition</i>	John T. McNeill
EELLS, HASTINGS: <i>Martin Bucer</i>	Albert Hyma
BOOKS RECEIVED	64

CHURCH HISTORY

STATEMENT OF POLICY

The quarterly magazine, *Church History*, of which this is the first issue, is the official organ of the American Society of Church History. It aims to represent the best scholarship which America affords in the field of the history of Christianity. It will encourage research on the part of American scholars as well as provide a professional journal where church history studies will find ready acceptance and be permanently accessible. Since the quarterly is a coöperative enterprise, the active interest of all students of church history is invited and confidently expected.

The quarterly will endeavor to keep its readers in contact with the best current literature of its subject, English, French, and German as well as American. Its reviews will be designed to assist American workers in church history by informing them concerning advances in their field.

As the official journal of the American Society of Church History, the quarterly will contain the records of the Society's meetings. It will also serve as a means of acquaintance among the members by publishing notes regarding their activities.

THE EDITORS.

CHURCH HISTORY

VOL. I

MARCH, 1932

No. 1

PERMANENT DEPOSITS OF SECTIONALISM IN AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY¹

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

The Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

About the fourth decade of the nineteenth century, a change came over the general spirit of American society. Historians have often noted the fact and they have described it and explained it in various ways. It was a time of storm and stress, a period of controversy and conflict and finally war. There was scarcely a single phase of life that was not infected. As if by some preconcerted signal the souls of men in most diverse groups and relationships suddenly became sensitive and combative. The result was one of those swift ruptures with the past that leave abiding scars in the body of society.

The American churches reflected faithfully the spirit that prevailed in the other phases of social life. And the students of church history have always been impressed with the spirit of controversy and competition that prevailed in American Christianity from about 1830 to about 1870.

The historians of American Christianity write about "that strange epidemic of controversy which ran simultaneously through

¹ The Presidential Address, delivered before the American Society of Church History, New York, December 28, 1931.

so many of the great religious organizations of the country." They ascribe it to a certain malignant and irresistible "infection of the times." Or they set forth that "the spirit of schism seemed to be in the air" and thus lay the blame on the sinister powers of the air. Some attribute it to the overwrought nerves of frontier life, or war-psychology with coming events casting their shadows before. Others simplify the matter by making it a purely moral problem, the issue between slavery and antislavery, and for such writers this epoch of disaster for religious organizations is ascribed to what is called "the southern apostasy", the assumption being that there was an apostasy on the part of the churches in the South from the universal moral sentiment of Christendom on the subject of human slavery.

The whole period is usually regarded as a passing bit of bad humor on the part of Americans in general that interrupted the even course of American history, disturbing the normal unfolding of national experience and delaying for nearly a generation the progress of Christianity in this part of the world. It is not generally observed that this middle age of the nineteenth century, with all its rancor and schism, is an integral element and a forward step in the development of American civilization, as integral as adolescence in the development of human personality.

If we were to characterize in a single word the prevailing spirit of 1830-1870 in American history we should call it sectionalism or factionalism. This is the spirit of disproportionate devotion to the interests that are peculiar to a part of the whole. This major devotion to minor objectives may become intensified to blind prejudice and veritable animosity against other parts of the same whole. It may lead to secession and segmentation and to the establishment of new units. The spirit of sectionalism may invade any institution or any aspect of society. It may apply to component parts of a country, to opposing political parties within the same government, or to groups that diverge on questions of economics, or industry, or literature, or art, or religion. When the spirit of sectionalism prevails, the interest of the whole is subordinated to the interest of the part or party or constituent group. It is the intolerance of an exaggerated loyalty to one's own persuasion. It makes men irascible and contentious and tends to produce lines of deep cleavage, either perpendicular or horizontal or both.

As applied to religion in a country where the voluntary principle prevails, the spirit of sectionalism means the abnormal development of the denominational consciousness until it becomes sec-

tarianism. This is the religion of individualistic imperialism. At its core it carries the spirit of Roman exclusiveness, but it utilizes the Protestant freedom of organization to create the widest diversity of religious groupings. Sectarianism makes dead earnest with the etymology of Protestantism and exaggerates the right of religious minorities to protest. It manifests itself in the angry parting of former allies, in the withdrawal from coöperation, in the sharp expression of ecclesiastical antitheses, in the fostering of competing organizations and conflicting interests, and often in unlovely disruption or schism.

The era of sectionalism in American history was a drastic reversal of the temper that had prevailed in the preceding forty years. The earlier period had been one of nationalism in politics and of coöperationism and even unionism in religion. It was a time of social equilibrium, a time of rapid growth but constant adaptation of institutions to meet the needs of society. In politics it was called "an era of good feelings." In religion it was a time of friendliness among the major bodies of Christians, a time of concession and accommodation among the constituent denominations of generic Christianity.

But the fourth decade of the century began to show disturbance of the social equilibrium. Historical factors that had been operating quietly for a generation now began to upset the former balance of social forces and soon threw all society into the vortex of conflicting emotions. The period that followed was a period of institutional re-adaption. It was a painful process. It meant war. But in the perspective of a century it is now clear that it was a necessary process and the social equilibration that emerged at the close of the process is a very positive result both for the Church and for the state.

It will not suffice to find the major cause of the disturbance in any one field or phase of society. It is the same social pattern in all fields, a pattern of sharp and increasing contrasts. It involved the entire social psychology of the people.

In industry, for example, there was no longer the uniformity that had prevailed from 1800 to 1830. An industrial revolution was taking place, here as in western Europe. Among its causes were the changing conditions of transportation and communication, the multiplying list of inventions, the rapid development of natural resources, and the expanding stream of immigration. These and other elements of revolutionary ferment led to profound organic processes. For one thing the institutional adaptation of these new

elements was different in different parts of the country. Applied to a variety of soil and climate and natural resources they produced a variety in modes of living, labor systems, and economic theories. Slowly the several sections began to realize that their habits were different and their interests at variance. The manufacturing North, the cotton-growing South, the farming and wool-growing West, each was slowly developing self-consciousness. And such was the temper of the times that in each section the synthesis of its own interests involved an antithesis against the particular interests of the other sections.

But the sweep of the economic forces does not in itself account for the great atmospheric changes that set in at this time. Many other elements helped to fashion the social climate. The differences among the merchant aristocracy in the East, the planter aristocracy of the South, and the pioneer community of the West, may be traced also to differences in cultural traditions of two centuries or more, to differences in background of education and ethics, of language and law. The relatively static condition of social institutions in the South, the rapid changes in the North, the disturbing suction of the vacuum in the far West, were due to historical and psychological factors quite as much as to economic factors.

Moreover, the lines of contrast were horizontal as well as perpendicular. That is, they established antitheses among the groups and classes as well as among the geographical sections. The flow of immigration set up the contrast between the native and the immigrant. The importation of large numbers of laborers from Europe produced the contrast between the free laborer and the slave. The growth of machine industry developed a contrast between the farmer and the manufacturer. The relative increase of cities brought the contrast between urban and rural. The upset of the economical levels of the preceding period introduced the contrast between poverty and abundance. The growing sensitiveness of human nature set up the contrast between humane feelings and alleged cruelty. And so the entire social landscape abounded in irritation points and friction areas. These contrasts, latitudinal and longitudinal; geographic and sociological, political and moral, seized every opportunity for expression. Pulpits, stages of theaters, and pages of public prints, were occupied with acrimonious debates on some topic or other. The spirit of factionalism was fed to a surfeit with literary outpourings and vigorous crusades for all kinds

of reform. The total result was to precipitate what may be called an "era of hard feeling."

It was the issue concerning slavery that produced the deepest lines of cleavage. The roots of the contest over human servitude go back far beyond the origin of the republic. But it was not until this period that sectionalism took slavery as its weapon and consciously opposed itself to the principle of nationalism. The conflict was not due to a "rebellion" on the part of the states in the South nor to an "apostasy" on the part of the churches in the South. The stirring of the waters was due to the fact that the whole stream of American history had to cross the shoals of the social landscape before it could enter the expanding valleys of the gilded age.

The issue of slavery and secession was a complicated one, but it could be made to appear simple. It was profoundly involved in history and constitutional law, in politics and economics, but it could be made to appear a purely moral question. Now when a great national democracy that is suffused to an exceptional degree with moral sentiments and religious traditions is brought to face squarely a simple moral issue, or what appears as a simple moral issue, it can be quickly aroused and not easily restrained. The result in American history is rightly called "the irrepressible conflict."

With such a background the student of church history or of social psychology would scarcely expect to find that the demon of antithesis had spared the religious organizations of the land from his ravaging sword during this period. Nor did he. The quickening evangelical impulse that had visited American Christianity at the beginning of the century was not lost but it was differentiated and diffused among the denominations which had been enlisted in the common tasks of the Church catholic. For their coöperation revealed the fact that each of them had its own method of doing Christian work. By the year 1830 the tendency towards unionism among the churches had run its natural course and in the next forty years it bore its natural fruit in divisions and subdivisions. Loyalty to one's own church once more came to be regarded as a virtue, but now this virtue was cultivated at the expense of loyalty to generic Christianity. The pendulum swung from unionism across to sectarianism, from perfervid emotionalism to dogmatic polemicism in religion and ethics.

It should be observed in passing that the spirit of controversy and factionalism in American Christianity was reinforced by thought-patterns imported from Europe. It was in this very period

that the Church of England was stirred by the Oxford movement, and the churches of Germany by a return to orthodox Lutheranism, and the Roman Catholic Church by a revival of the Jesuits whose activity led by way of the decree on the immaculate conception to the dogma of papal infallibility. Moreover, the course of events in general American history provided a convenient battlefield for ecclesiastical warfare. The opening of the Mississippi Valley and the great immigration that swept into it and beyond it during this period furnished a wide field for the competitive energies of rival sects and left permanent deposits in buildings and institutions that to this day bear eloquent witness to the infection of sectarian intolerance that prevailed during this Middle Age of American Christianity.

It is not within the purpose or scope of this paper to detail the facts either of political history or of church history from 1830 to 1870. They are too well known to call for review here. We only propose to add a little more light in estimating the permanent results of the events in the religious history of the period.

The process by which the spirit of sectionalism came to expression in the religious organizations of the country was monotonously similar in all cases. And the technique of factionalism was fairly simple: first they quarreled, then they fought, then they separated. As in politics sectionalism issued in bisectionalism, so in religion sectarianism issued in dissectionarianism.

Protestants fought Catholics and received counter-attacks. Catholics quarreled among themselves on trusteeism, on racial issues, and on differences among clerical sects. Protestants not only withdrew from general organizations into their own churches and denominations, but each group then proceeded to dispute and separate within its own household. In the Protestant Episcopal Church it was the predominance of the High Church party over the Evangelicals. The Presbyterians had their theological as well as their geographic contrasts, dividing first into Old School and New School, and then subdividing into North and South. The Congregationalists after the dissolution of the Plan of Union with the Presbyterians, divided on the administration of benevolences and Hartford faced Yale. The Methodists divided on an issue of polity and then split on the slavery question. The Baptists produced an offshoot in the Disciples and then bisected on slavery. The Lutherans quarreled vigorously on doctrinal and practical questions and then crystallized into national groups, divided on the secession

of the South, and subdivided at the North into General Synod and General Council. The Reformed had their struggle over the Mercersburg theology and their quarrel between German Reformed and Dutch Reformed. The Quakers staged a friendly dispute that gave them their Hicksites versus Orthodox. Even the Unitarians produced their separatists in groups known as Universalists, Transcendentalists, and Pantheists. Moreover, many new sects arose during this period to multiply the internal discord by contributing divergent currents and eddies to the general stream of religious life. Such were Mormonism, Spiritualism, Millerism, and Adventism in its various subdivisions. Probably the most unlovely aspect of this internecine strife was the disruption of the benevolent organizations and the bitter litigation over church properties. Dogged polemics and party spirit ran high in every sphere. The parallel between political history and religious history was complete. The spirit as well as the body of the adolescent American giant was shaken with the passions of embittered religious antagonisms.

Now amid all this perpendicular upheaval of social dynamics it is possible also to discover a horizontal thrust of the historic movement. The wounds of such civil warfare are not quickly healed. Only the patient processes of several generations could coax back the loyalty of the southern states to the federal union. Among the churches nothing but a new social landscape could suffice to adjourn the ill-will and jealousies and conscientious hostility that battled in the middle period. But when at last the troubled waters of society recovered to a degree their former calmness, we find that the stream of history has carried both state and Church into an entirely new climate. It would be a serious practical blunder now to try to turn the stream back and mechanically to pump it up over the shoals into the enervating atmosphere of antebellum or antediluvian times. The Civil War period was not an interruption of the course of history; it was a period of definite progress.

The important results for the religious situation of our day that have come out of this turbulent period that began about a hundred years ago can be evaluated only in the perspective of several generations.

By the end of the nineteenth century the course of events had brought the nation to an entirely new situation. It is known politically as the new nationalism. This is very different from the na-

tionalism that prevailed in the youth of the republic. In that earlier period the federal government was strengthened step by step at the expense of the state governments. The so-called "implied powers" of the federal constitution were always subtracted from the powers of the states constituting the union. But at the close of the nineteenth century an entirely new set of problems had arisen out of the marvelous expansion and growth of the nation. These problems called for the exercise of new powers of government which were neither written in the state constitutions nor implied in the federal constitution. The main political issue was how to meet the complicated social and industrial problems facing the country. In this serious situation it was well that the demon of sectionalism had had his day and served his purpose. The nation did not need to dissipate its energies now in defining the respective rights of states and federal government. Whether the changed problems were to be met through the exercise of state or federal power was a matter of little concern to most of the people and their law-making representatives. But it was insisted that all functions of government, legislative, executive and judicial, must be so readjusted that in every part of the complicated social fabric there will be *either state or national control*, so that no neutral sphere will be left open to the predatory special interests.

This was the spirit of the new nationalism. As a matter of practice it multiplied the powers of the central government. It increased the force of the nation as such. It strengthened the bonds of union among the states. But it must be emphasized that this tendency did not for a moment diminish the powers and joys of the individual states that compose the federal union. Herein lies the chief point of distinction between the new nationalism and the nationalism of the early nineteenth century.

Quite similar were the developments in the sphere of religion. As sectionalism in politics opened the way for the new nationalism, so sectarianism in religion opened the way for the new denominationalism.

When American Christianity had passed the shoals of religious acrimony and partisanship, it found itself fronting new problems and engaged in activities that changed the attitude of the churches towards one another. The church history which they had begun to study during the preceding period but which had been carried only far enough to deepen their denominational loyalties and make each communion conscious of its own historic life, was now carried through to the point where it made them conscious of

a mightier life common to them all and historic in a far grander sense than any one of them. The continued study of church history led men to see that the various types of Christian life represented in the various Christian denominations might be different without being necessarily in conflict.

More important than the intellectual urge in releasing the spirit of American Christianity from the dominance of sectarianism was the great change in the conditions that it faced. The growing complexity of American society, the relative increase in the numerical strength of the churches, the new sense of stewardship and enterprise, the growth of intensive organization, and many other factors, combined to make Christian coöperation imperative.

This did not mean a return to the religious conditions that prevailed in the youth of the republic. At the beginning of the nineteenth century Christians had sought to banish sectarianism too. But their results were not lasting because they were mistaken in their methods. By seeking to hide the manifold life of Christianity beneath the temporary cloak of evangelicalism they had threatened to turn the Church universal into one vast sect. The reaction could not fail to come, and in the middle period men hugged sectarianism in fond embrace. The end of the century heard another protest against all forms of narrow sectarianism. But this time there was little effort at artificial fusion of the churches and no tendency whatever to surrender distinctive tenets, but a calm and frank recognition of a unity of motive in a diversity of method.

This was not unionism but a new denominationalism. The desire for uniformity among the denominations in matters of belief or ritual or administration that prevailed in the early period did not reappear, but there was simply an inextinguishable longing for something like intellectual toleration and Christian coöperation. Herein lay the positive progress that may be credited to the period of sectionalism. In political life there had come to be a clear definition of rights as between states and federal authority and a fairly clear division of labor between them so as to cover the whole field of governmental need. It was recognized that the nation must command the supreme allegiance of all the states, but at the same time it was insisted that the rights of the states be freely asserted and frankly admitted by the national authority. So in religious life the supreme allegiance of the churches to Jesus Christ did not hinder them from being true to their separate histories and cultivating their denominational consciousness, while yet arranging

among themselves such a division of labor as would leave no territory unoccupied to become the camping ground of such special privilege as the world, the flesh, and the devil. This was the spirit of the new denominationalism.

As a matter of practice, this new spirit among the denominations strengthened the sense of common purpose among Christians, called for a clearing-house for Christian coöperation, and increased the force of Christianity in its impact on secular culture. But it must be emphasized that this tendency did not invade the integrity of the individual churches that constitute Protestant Christianity. Herein lies the chief point of distinction between the new denominationalism and the unionism of the early nineteenth century.

In fine, then, the permanent deposits of sectionalism in American Christianity, as these deposits have been screened through a period of industrialism and a period of federalism, are two: (1) the persistence of the denominational type, and (2) the general recognition of the claims of generic Christianity.

The denominations of our day have their political parallel in the states, not in the political parties. To-day each state or section can maintain its own identity and cultivate its own life within the federal union without being charged with sectionalism, provided the loyalty of its citizens to the state does not supersede their loyalty to the federal government. Likewise each denomination to-day may cultivate its own standards and use its own methods without being charged with sectarianism, provided the loyalty of its members to the denomination does not supersede their loyalty to generic Christianity.

To speak of the denominations of our day as necessarily in competition or in "rival camps" is to view the present situation with obsolete emotions. To look upon the multiplicity of small churches in the towns of our land as a charge against the clarified denominationalism of our day is an anachronism. To confuse the denominational expression of Christianity throughout its history with the rancorous sectarianism of 1830-1870 is an offense against the historical perspective. To insist that the present-day divisions among Christians are of necessity a scandal because they weaken the force of the Christian impact, and not to see that the divisions among Christians may be the integrated divisions of an advancing army, does violence not only to the lexicon but also to the historical sense. The historian sees no more hope of wiping out denominational lines than of wiping out the boundaries among the states. On the other hand, the historian sees no more prospect of success-

ful sectarian isolation to-day than of a successful revival of nullification and secession.

Practical religious policies based upon anachronisms or perverted historical perspectives are foredoomed to failure. The denominational lines of our day have deep social sources and far-reaching historical roots, so that they cannot be wished out of existence or commanded to disappear.

Moreover, if all the states were New York, where were the Union? If all the churches were of one type or name, where were the Church universal? If the Church were resolved into the corporation of the saints, where were the communion of the saints? There can be no liberty without unity; and there can be no real unity or liberty without diversity. Liberty and unity, one and inseparable, this is the spirit of the new denominationalism. And for this the period of sectionalism was the necessary prelude.

MEDICINE FOR SIN AS PRESCRIBED IN THE PENITENTIALS

JOHN T. MCNEILL

Divinity School of the University of Chicago

During the past century the textual criticism and literary history of the Penitentials have received considerable attention,¹ but the investigation of their actual function in social and church life has only begun.² Yet the field is inviting. The Penitentials have, for instance, notable legal and economic aspects; they offer considerable information on ascetic practices, they have a bearing on ritual developments; and the relation of their relaxations, compositions and commutations of penance to the development of Indulgences is itself an important question. It is not the purpose of the present article to investigate any of these, but to suggest still another angle of approach. I wish to present some elementary considerations toward the answer to a question which is perhaps more basic than any of those just suggested. The question may be stated thus: What did the Penitentials contribute, and what were they designed to contribute, to the cure of souls? The cure of souls (*cura animarum*) means of course the general ministry of religion in the care, and only incidentally the healing, of souls. But the penitent was regarded as one morally diseased and ill, and his treatment is, in the Penitentials, repeatedly, even habitually, referred to as the task of the moral physician. His sins are the symptoms of disease. The penalties enforced are "*medicamenta*," "*remedia*," "*fomenta*"—measures designed to restore his moral and spiritual health.

At the risk of being classed with a long-departed generation of historical writers who began with Adam, I am impelled here to go back about ten centuries behind the earliest examples of the

¹ Where not otherwise indicated, editions of the penitentials here referred to will be found in Wasserschleben, F. W. H., *Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche*, Halle, 1851. They are also contained in the volumes by H. J. Schmitz, *Die Bussbücher und die Bussdisciplin der Kirche*, Mainz, 1883, and *Die Bussbücher und das kanonische Bussverfahren*, Düsseldorf, 1898.

² See for instance: Oakley, T. P., *English Penitential Discipline and Anglo-Saxon Law* (Columbia University Studies), New York, 1923, and the present writer's *The Celtic Penitentials and their Influence on Continental Christianity*, Paris, 1923, of which four chapters appeared in *Revue Celtique*, XXXIX, (1922). 257-300; XL, (1923) 51-103; 320-341.

Celtic penitential literature. Under the guidance of the historians of ancient medicine,³ we shall trace in a paragraph or two a line of development in medical theory and practice which seems to have furnished to the compilers of penitentials, through the Egyptian monks and John Cassian, a certain fundamental presupposition that must first be understood. Probably Semitic scholarship would take us back a great deal farther; for it is believed⁴ that the Pythagoreans took from Babylonian sources a table of contraries of which they made use in philosophy and in medicine. It was Alkmaion of Crotona (c. B. C. 500) who laid the foundation of Greek medical literature. In his *Περὶ Φύσεως*, he developed a doctrine of the equilibrium of material qualities such as "cold:warm," "moist:dry," "sweet:bitter," etc. His medical aim was the restoration of a lost equilibrium of these qualities. New force was given to the principle by Asclepiades of Prusa in Bithynia about B. C. 100, under the influence of the atomic theory of the Epicureans. This eminent physician opposed the maxim of Hippocrates that nature is the healer of disease, and sought to induce a return to proper atomic movement by fasting, proscription of meat, gymnastics, and other mechanic means. Asclepiades taught and practiced in Rome, and was the principal agent in overcoming Roman opposition to Greek medical science.

His pupil Themison of Laodicea, c. B. C. 50, is regarded as the founder of the Methodist school of medicine which was to dominate the Roman period and the early middle ages. He too worked in Rome, and though Juvenal jested over the number of his patients who died, he won considerable respect and is frequently mentioned by his distinguished successor, Celsus, as a major authority. Themison gave a new simplification and formulation to the principle of contraries, by regarding disease as a failure of the proper equilibrium of rigidity and relaxation. His treatment

³ Of the works consulted for this part of the study, the following have proved the most useful: Buck, A. H. *The Growth of Medicine . . . to about 1800*. New Haven, 1917. Cumston, C. G. *An Introduction to the History of Medicine*. New York, 1927. Fort, G. B. *Medical Economy in the Middle Ages*. New York, 1883. Garrison, F. H. *An Introduction to the History of Medicine*. Philadelphia, 1924. Hoeser, H. *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Medizin*. 3rd edition, 3 vols. Jena, 1875. Lambert, L. W. and Godwin, G. M. *Medical Leaders from Hippocrates to Osler*. Indianapolis, 1929. Moon, R. O. *The Relation of Medicine to Philosophy*. New York, 1909. Moulton, C. W. *The History of Medicine*. New York, 1905. Neuburger, M. *The History of Medicine*. (tr. Playfair). 2 vols. London, 1910. Power, Sir D'Arcy, and Thompson, C. J. S. *Chronologia Medica*. London, 1923. Scheller, E. *Aulus Cornelius Celsus über die Arzneiwissenschaft*, 2nd edition (W. Frieohls), 2 vols. Braunschweig, 1906. Walsh, J. J. *Old Time Makers of Medicine*. New York, 1911.

⁴ Neuburger, I, 107.

therefore "consists in remedying the *strictum* or *laxum* by means of opposing therapeutic measures acting upon the whole body."⁵

The Methodist school attained its zenith in Soranus of Ephesus, who received his education in Alexandria, practiced there and in Rome, during the first quarter of the second century, was called *medicorum princeps*, and published weighty treatises which gave him wide influence and popularity. Historians are of the opinion that Soranus, with his emphasis on the contraries and his special attention to obstetrics, was much better known than Galen, whose contributions to physiology and anatomy were not greatly appreciated by his contemporaries.⁶ Galen called the Methodists "the asses of Thessalus," but adopted a modification of their principle of contraries, and exempted Soranus from his abuse.⁷ The fame of Soranus is shown by Tertullian's respectful references to his now lost work on the soul.⁸ Augustine too knew Soranus, and twice cites his writings with admiration.⁹ His renown persisted in the Middle Ages. John of Salisbury places him beside Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and Seneca,¹⁰ and the Salerno physicians of the twelfth century apparently felt his influence.¹¹ His work and principles were popularized by the physician Caelius Aurelianus of Sicca in Numidia, a distinguished later Methodist of uncertain date.¹² The works of Caelius are mainly bad Latin translations from the Greek of Soranus, neither language having been the Numidian's native speech. The Methodists were freely accused of violating their own favorite doctrine, and apparently they were not too doctrinaire in practice. We are not here concerned with their methods, but with the publicity they gave to the principle of contraries—*contraria*

⁵ Neuburger, I, 209. Cf. Cumston, pp. 124ff. The relation of Themison to Asclepiades is somewhat differently viewed by Moulton, pp. 243 ff., but the point is not of importance here. Some writers regard Asclepiades as the founder of the Methodists, Cf. Moon, p. 28.

⁶ Lambert, p. 58; Neuburger, I, 308-9.

⁷ Cumston, p. 133; Lambert pp. 52, 57.

⁸ Tertullian, *de Anima*, vi, viii, xiv, xliv. Soranus appears from these passages to have taught that the soul itself has a physical existence, and is not merely dependent on the functioning of the bodily organs. He does not, however, teach its indestructibility; but Tertullian uses him to confute still more negative views.

⁹ *Contra Julianum*, V, 51 ("Soranus medicinae auctor nobilissimus"). *Retractationes*, II, lxii.

¹⁰ *Policraticus*, ed. C. C. J. Webb, Oxford 1909, Vol. I, p. 29.

¹¹ Cumston p. 134.

¹² Caelius has been placed in the second, but more generally in the fourth or fifth century. See Cumston pp. 134-5 and especially Hoeser, I, 321-334. Power and Thompson, p. 41, date him about 400.

contrariis curantur. So far had the principle become a medical axiom that Alexander of Tralles (525-605), who can hardly be called a Methodist, wrote: "The duty of a physician is to cool what is hot, to warm what is cold, to dry what is moist and to moisten what is dry."¹³

The next stage in our story has to do with Cassian and the monks. The Eastern monks not infrequently served in hospitals¹⁴ and Palladius informs us that the monks of Nitria were provided with physicians.¹⁵ It would be very surprising, then, if the monastics were not familiar with the principle of contraries as taught by the reigning school of medicine. John Cassian, as is well known, visited the Egyptian monastic colonies, and some years afterwards (c. 420-35) wrote his *Collationes*, in which he reports the discourses of distinguished abbots and saints of the desert. He does not profess to give verbatim, shorthand records; but there is no reason to doubt that he conveys on the whole an accurate account of what he actually learned from these masters of asceticism. In *Coll. xix*, 14, 15 ("Conference of Abbot John") it is explained that the cure for anger, dejection, and other sins lies in opposing to them their opposites: "*per objectionem contrarium rerum*," and the whole treatment of sins in the works of Cassian seems largely in accord with this precept.

Now Cassian was an author peculiarly well known and authoritative in the Celtic Church. His handling of the capital sins (*Coll. v*, "Conference of Abbot Serapion") is definitely reflected in more than half a dozen of the Penitentials, and furnishes the outline of three of them. When therefore we read the following passage in Finnian's Penitential written in Ireland probably during the second quarter of the sixth century, we are on sure ground in supposing that Cassian gave him the keynote:

"But if a cleric is avaricious, this is a great offence. Avarice is pronounced idolatry, but it can be corrected by liberality and alms. This is the penance of his offence, that he cure and correct contraries by contraries.

"If a cleric is wrathful or envious or backbiting, gloomy or greedy, great and capital sins are these, and they slay the soul and cast it down to the depth of hell; but this is the penance for them, until they are plucked forth and eradicated from our hearts through the help of the Lord, and through our zeal and activity

¹³ Quoted by Walsh, p. 46.

¹⁴ Moon, p. 65.

¹⁵ Budge, E. A. W., *The Paradise of the Holy Fathers*, London, 1917, Vol. I, p. 100.

let us seek the mercy of the Lord and victory in these things, and so long as we shall continue in weeping and tears day and night these things are turned over in our heart; but by contraries, as we said, let us hasten to cure contraries, and cleanse away the faults from our heart and introduce virtues in their places,—and patience must arise for wrathfulness; kindness, or the love of God and of one's neighbor, for envy; for detraction restraint of heart and tongue; for dejection (*tristitia*), spiritual joy; for greed, liberality,”¹⁶ etc.

I take from the Penitential of Columban (c. 600) a few sentences that equally exemplify the employment of the medical principle of contraries:

“The talkative person is to be sentenced to silence, the disturber to gentleness, the gluttonous to fasting, the sleepy fellow to watchfulness, the proud to imprisonment, the deserter to expulsion. Diversity of guilt occasions diversity of penalty; for even the physicians of bodies prepare their remedies in various sorts. For they treat wounds in one way, fevers in another, bruises in another, festering sores in another, defective sight in another, burns in another. So therefore the spiritual physicians ought to heal with various sorts of treatment the wounds, fevers, transgressions, sorrows, sicknesses and infirmities of souls.”

And he indicates that only a few are capable of administering the proper treatment “to restore illness to the full state of health.”¹⁷ Jonas of Bobbio, Columban’s early biographer, shows familiarity with the customary medical language applied in the Penitentials, when he tells how the people about Luxeuil rushed in from all directions to Columban for the remedy of penance,—“undique ad poenitentiae medicamenta plebes concurrere.”¹⁸

The Preface of the Penitential of Theodore, by an admirer of the Archbishop who calls himself Discipulus Umbrensum, reports that Theodore, having been inquired of by different persons, prepared a booklet “for the remedy (*remedium*) of penance.” The work is addressed by the editor “to all Catholics of the English and especially to the physicians of souls,” with a pious wish for their “*sanabilem salutem*” in the Lord Christ. The provisions of the book are further described as “*hujus fomenta medicaminis*,” the relieving treatments, applications, of this medicine, and it is stated that “the Lord Jesus . . . proclaimed: ‘Do penance,’ etc., (*penitentiam agite*) . . . to those who had no ‘medicamenta.’”

¹⁶ *Penitentiale Vinniai*, 28, 29.

¹⁷ *Poenitentiale Columbani*, A, 12, and B, introductory paragraph.

¹⁸ *Vita S. Columbani*, 17. He has already remarked on the virtual absence of “*poenitentiae medicamenta*” in Gaul before Columban. *Ibid.* Ch. 11.

The true Penitential of Cummean,—probably the seventh century Irish saint, Cummean the Tall,—was identified and published by Zettinger in 1902.¹⁹ This Penitential begins:

"Here begins the prologue, and the health-giving medicine of souls.

"As we are about to tell of the remedies of wounds . . . first we shall indicate the treatments by the method of an abridgement . . ."

Then follows a passage closely modelled on Caesarius of Arles, *Homilies XII*, "On the Twelve Remissions of Sins." Caesarius has here done little more than compress a more extended passage in Cassian, *Coll. XX*, 8 : ("Conference of Abbot Pinufius") which describes "the fruits of penitence by which we attain to the expiation of our sins." At the end of the introduction Cummean has this language:

"And so they (i. e. the fathers) determine that the eight principal vices contrary to human salvation shall be healed by these eight contrary remedies. For it is an old proverb: 'Contraries are cured by their contraries (*contraria contrariis sanantur*)'."

Cummean purposefully attempts to apply the principle of contraries in the actual prescriptions for penance, as those which follow, taken from the section on Gluttony, will indicate:

"Those who are drunk with wine or beer . . . if they have taken the vow of sanctity shall expiate the fault for forty days with bread and water; laymen, however, for seven days. He who compels anyone, for the sake of good fellowship (*humanitatis gratia*) to become drunk, shall do penance in the same manner as one who is drunk.

"He who is not able to sing psalms, being benumbed in his tongue, shall perform a special fast.

"He who anticipates the canonical hour (for eating), or takes something more delicate than the others have, only on account of appetite, shall go without supper, and live for two days on bread and water."

Here are the principal terms of the two canons which compose Cummean's short section on Languor (*accidia*):

"The idler shall be taxed with an extraordinary work, and the slothful with a lengthened vigil . . . Any wandering or unstable man shall be healed by residing in a single place and by application to work."

These passages are drawn from four penitentials which all students of the subject would recognize as among the most im-

¹⁹ "Das Poenitentiale Cummeani," *Zeitschr. f. katholisches Kirchenrecht*, LXXXII (1902), 501-540.

portant and authoritative. Similar language might be taken from many of the minor documents of the series. The medical analogy in some form is characteristic of the Penitentials as a whole, and the principle of healing by contraries is often discoverable even where it is not explicitly stated. Let one example suffice. It is from the *Corrector and Physician* of Burchard (c. 1012), Chapter VII.

"Therefore, if thou hast been proud hitherto, humble thyself in the sight of God. If thou hast loved vain glory, take thought lest on account of transitory praise thou lose an eternal reward. If the rust of envy has hitherto consumed thee,—which is a very great sin and above all things detestable, since an envious man is compared to the devil who first envied man the gift which he himself had lost though his own fault—do penance and prune thy advantage over others. If dejection overwhelms thee, practice patience and longsuffering. If the fever of avarice oppresses thee, consider that it is the root of all evils and is compared to idolatry, and hence it behooves thee to be liberal. If anger vexes thee, which finds lodgement in the breasts of fools, thou ought'st to be controlled in thy spirit, and thou shalt put it to flight from thee by tranquillity of mind. If gluttony has enticed to devour thee, follow after temperance; if lust²⁰, promise chastity."

If the maxim "*Contraria contrariis sanantur*" which Cumanus calls an old proverb, is ultimately derived from the Methodist physicians, we may well ask: What has become of their principle of equilibrium? For Themison and Soranus health was the effect of a balance between a rigid and lax state; but for the saints soul-health was not a balance between vice and virtue; it was the overcoming of evil with good. To sin they gave no quarter; it was something to be totally eradicated. It may be true to say that to men intent on salvation from sin equilibrium is not a particularly attractive idea. It has the status of neutrality in a world war. Yet in large degree the Penitentials seek to recover to the offender a balanced state of mind. There is nothing that impresses itself more upon the student of the Penitentials than their moderation, fundamental humaneness and freedom from fanaticism. It is indeed somewhat remarkable how unobtrusive is the supernatural element in these documents, how rarely appears any suggestion of spiritual terror, and how relatively prominent is the non-miraculous benefit to the penitent from the faithful performance of the exercises that are the medicine for his sin. In an age in which most writers were dominated by the supernatural, the framers of these codes seem to have possessed a fairly clear conception of the operation of law in the personal life.

²⁰ "luxuria", "excess".

If then we find no conscious adoption of the principle of equilibrium in the Penitentials, we discover in them the evidence of a closely parallel concept. They offer the means of the rehabilitation of personality, recovering to the sinner the lost personal values of which his offences have deprived him. Penance was designed and expected to bring the penitent into harmony with himself, and into right relations with the church, society and God. He was taught that penance offered a complete and unfailing remedy for his vices and misdeeds. "There is no crime" says Finnian (47) "that cannot be completely expiated by penance,"—and his reference is to the sin of a priest who refuses baptism to a dying child and so causes the loss of a soul. The completion of the appointed penance brought restoration to communion and participation in the fellowship of the church. In the case of acts of violence or other crimes against persons, the penance involved payments in satisfaction to the injured or to the relatives of the slain. Thus the offender made his peace with society and was protected against private punishment and freed from social censure. He could once more function as a normal person, and his sense of personality was restored. It was implied in all this that he was absolved from the guilt that would otherwise entail pains in the life to come. He was made confident of being restored to the favor of God. For such benefits he was willing to undergo a severe and protracted course of treatments. But beyond these social and theological considerations we see in the detailed prescriptions the objective of an inward moral change, the setting up of a process of character-reconstruction and the correction of special personal defects.

The casual reader of the penitential literature is in some danger of missing these facts. In the main, of course, the Penitentials are codes, not disquisitions on sin and its cure. They are tariffs of the penances appropriate to specific sins committed in act or thought. They exhibit a prodigious variety of sins and of penalties. The offences catalogued in them provide an insight into the perversity of human nature in general and in particular the status of morals in the early period of Western Christianity. Taken as evidence on social conditions, the Penitentials offer anything but a pleasant picture. The law of crimes is made for criminals, not for the law-abiding, and all criminal codes form depressing reading. We have no means of knowing how often the more heinous offences noted in the Penitentials were actually committed; but we may be sure that the saintly men who wrote these books did not invent merely hypothetical sins. They were dealing with real life as they them-

selves had closely observed it. There is a large class of these misdemeanors that would be likely to be made known only in the secret place of the confessional. In this way the Penitentials are more intimate with human nature in its viler aspects than any state code.

This fact calls forth a question as to the real motives of the penitent. Why did he confide his shameful sins to a confessor and accept an exacting and painful penance? Are we to suppose that the sole motive was relief from the fear of penalties in the future life for unexpiated sins? Or did he feel the need of guidance toward a better and more satisfying way of life and toward the recovery of his self-respect? Very likely both these motives were potent. But he knew that confession would be followed not only by counsel but also by punishment. It is impossible not to suspect that his attitude was in many cases that of a craving for punishment such as psychologists to-day connect with sex conditions and call masochism. Was submission to penance itself an aberration? If there is anything in this suggestion, it equally applies to many of the more drastic features of asceticism not formally connected with the practice of penance. Such a judgment would seem to involve labelling a large proportion of the Christian population of that age as abnormal. Earlier Christian writers saw in corresponding, if more savage, pagan practices, only madness. Minucius Felix, referring to the exposure to winter weather in the Lupercalia and the rites attended by venesection and other self-mutilations, observes how half-insane pagan devotees incite one another to fanaticism. "The large number of mad men," he caustically remarks, "is the excuse for the general madness."²¹ But can madness really be general? In becoming general does it not cease to be madness? In an age when asceticism and penance are approved by the leaders of society, many practices which a non-ascetic age regards as aberrations are naturally accepted as healthful and as the very means to mental health.

In the assignment of penances the confessor was taught to regard himself not as the administrator of a law of crimes but as the physician of souls; and apparently there was some effort to bring this point to the notice of the penitents themselves. Columban would have the faithful diligently make confession before coming to mass, not only of the greater but of the lesser sins, and chiefly "of the motions of the mind," in order "to wash away the inde-

²¹ *Octavius*, xxii.

terminate vices and fevers of the sick soul."²² Sometimes, indeed, the confessor is exhorted to identify himself as far as possible with the offender, and become sympathetically familiar with his state of mind. "No physician," says the Pseudo-Romanum (c. 830) "can treat the wounds of the sick unless he familiarizes himself with their foulness—*nisi foetoribus particeps fuerit.*" This is essentially the principle of "identification" employed in present day psychiatry.

A nearer modern parallel to the materials of the Penitentials than that presented by codes of criminal law, lies in the observations of psychologists who deal with abnormal cases. Some of the case studies of Professor W. Stekel in his *Sadism and Masochism*²³ indicate the persistence in our own day of the perversions and aberrations which the Penitentials record. Their authors do not attempt to pursue these conditions to their roots as do the psychoanalysts. They saw no necessity of this: for them these symptoms were forms of sin, and sin was due to causes theologically more than psychically known. But the careful reader will probably conclude that their psycho-therapy was not so defective as their psychology.

It is true that many of the provisions laid down in the Penitentials seem inhuman, judged by present standards of law and present methods of personal treatment; but we have little reason to judge them by present standards or methods. Their authors of necessity could not be sharers in the sensitive humanitarianism of to-day; and perhaps a rough age may have required harsher soul-medicine than could be wisely employed in our softened society.²⁴ However that may be, we shall misunderstand these codes entirely if we do not observe the frequent incidental remarks of their authors designed to protect the penitent from too great severity—"lest the soul utterly perish from so long a time of the celestial medicine," to quote a phrase of Gildas.²⁵ A principle

²² *Poenit. Col.*, B. 30.

²³ Tr. L. Brink, New York, 1929. 2 vols.

²⁴ The sinner, or the neurotic, has ways of punishing himself, as severe as those authorized in the church, and much less helpful. My friend, Professor S. B. Sniffen, who has given me valuable suggestions on this section of the article, has remarked to me at this point: "It is probable that neurotic difficulties, particularly of a compulsive and depressive nature, were forestalled by the availability of the ecclesiastical mechanism for punishment."

²⁵ It seems unnecessary here to supply the word "*inopia*", as Haddan and Stubbs suggest (*Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents I*, 113), obviously with the idea that the "celestial medicine" is the Eucharist from which the penitent was excluded. The text is clear as it stands, and quite intelligible in the light of the common phraseology of the Penitentials.

of humanity, of good-will toward the sinner, of consideration for moral and physical weakness, is frequently apparent. "All are not to be weighed in one and the same balance," says an Anglo-Saxon penitential mistakenly ascribed to Bede, ". . . but there is discrimination for each of these, namely, between rich and poor; freeman, slave; little child, boy, young man, adolescent, old man; stupid, learned, layman, cleric; monk, bishop, presbyter, deacon, sub-deacon, reader; ordained or unordained, married or unmarried; pilgrim, virgin, canoness, nun; weak, sick, well."²⁶ A closely parallel passage appears in a number of Anglo-Saxon documents. Cummean impressively enjoins confessors to "take the sinner, by warning, exhortation, teaching, lead him to penance, correct him of his errors, amend him of his faults, and make him such that God is rendered favorable to him . . .".²⁷ The Bigotian Penitential repeatedly insists upon distinctions not only between sins but between sinners; their virtues and qualities are to be considered, "that thou punish not with the rod that which is worthy of the sword, nor with the sword that which is worthy of the rod." This element of discrimination and considerateness saves the Penitentials from being mere ruthless scales of penalties. They are evidently the work of mature minds, familiar from experience in the confessional with all imaginable sins, wise in the lore of human nature, and completely devoid of fanatical obsessions.

It should be remembered too that in the treatment prescribed by these experts for the diseased condition which they called sin, they combined with the results of their own experience the practice of previous generations. The duration of the penalty is often prescribed from the acts of ancient church councils or the decisions given in Basil's "Canonical" letter to Amphilochius; but there is enough variation from authority to show independent judgment. In their provisions regarding satisfaction to the injured or the kindred of the slain they followed the ancient custom of the Indo-European peoples which persisted in the Celtic and in the Germanic society. The emphasis on the private character of penance was not improbably also derived from the parallel practice of soul guidance in pre-Christian Celtic life. It represents, in any case, an advance psychologically on the public humiliation involved in the ancient church penance as described by Tertullian or Basil. It was more personal, more considerate of personality; and, in the hands of a

²⁶ Wasserschleben, H., *Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche*, p. 250.

²⁷ Zettinger, *op. cit.*, p. 540.

wise confessor, it was administered with a view not so much to retributive punishment as to the moral restoration of the penitent. The task of personal guidance is of course always a difficult one, and not improbably the best of confessors often saw their efforts frustrated.

While it would be unhistorical to expect to find the penitential codes in accordance with the standards of the present age, it is none the less permissible, and would be highly instructive, to compare their provisions with the methods of contemporary psychotherapy. Such a comparison to be of real value would have to be somewhat extensive, and it is here excluded for that reason. Another good reason for omitting it lies in the limitations of the writer's knowledge of the second member of the proposed comparison. It may be useful, however, to cite one or two generalisations made by present-day authorities who, if they do not know the Penitentials, know something of the confessional practice which grew out of them. W. H. R. Rivers defends the stress laid in the confessional upon "the apparently minor faults which have led up to definitely immoral conduct," and notes "the close resemblance of the traditional practice of the Catholic church with that of most systems of psycho-therapy."²⁸ Pierre Janet, discussing the value of solitude in certain cases, remarks that "in this respect as in others religion has taken the initiative;" and he quotes a joint work by two French authorities who say that "solitude is to the mind what dieting is to the body." It would be easy to cite numerous passages from the Penitentials which exemplify the methods commended in these quotations. On the other hand, Janet's disapproval of "rigorous and protracted isolation" would offer a basis for severe criticism of some penitential provisions as means of personality reconstruction.²⁹ It would be of great interest to read, as some day we may, the reactions of trained psychologists to the prescriptions for fasting, psalm-singing, fatiguing postures, vigils, flagellations, exile, silence, and the multitude of other penalties which are habitually laid down in these documents. Probably, however, the most reliable psycho-therapeutic agency in the system lay in the making of a full and unreserved confession in which the mind was relieved of its tension and its weight of guilt. We who approach the Penitentials with the ordinary equipment of the historical worker, will have to call the psychologists to our aid. It is

²⁸ *Medicine, Magic and Religion*, London and New York. 1924, p. 143.

²⁹ *Psychological Healing*, tr. E. and C. Paul, London and New York, 1925. I, 485 ff.

hoped that this fragment of interpretation may at least convey the impression that the authors of the Penitentials were concerned not only, in Mr. Gilbert's phrase, "to make the punishment fit the crime,"³⁰ but, in the words of a greater poet, to "minister to the mind diseased."

³⁰ Which, by the way, is a light comedy rendering of Deut. 25:2.

THE ANABAPTISTS. THE REFORMERS, AND THE CIVIL GOVERNMENT

HAROLD H. SCHAFF, Syracuse University¹

In dealing with the Anabaptists as a group which discovered or held political and social views of their own, it is first of all desirable to escape from any possible preconceived notion to the effect that the term "Anabaptist" must be used to designate a variety of groups all united to a greater or less degree by some principles or beliefs commonly held. At the outset of the movement such men as Konrad Grebel and Felix Manz, in Switzerland, gave some semblance of unity to the various divisions of the sect by moving from one place to another, and by thus serving somewhat in the capacity of liaison officers. But the movement was still very young when one must say of it that there were a great many small and distinct groups which held nothing of any importance in common, yet which were generally to be designated under the term Anabaptist. Thus, considering the real character of the Anabaptist movement and its chief significance—which I take to be social—the name given to the Anabaptists is less relevant than at first might be supposed. The sectaries did not call themselves Anabaptists; and they resented the use of the name by others.² At least from the year 1525 on the name was nothing but an external designation for the various sects. As Sebastian Franck³ has affirmed, the sects were so disunited amongst themselves that he scarcely knew how to write anything certain or final about them; and he was unable to find even two Anabaptist congregations which held views exactly the same. Heinrich Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli at Zürich, and a vigorous opponent of the Anabaptists, has said⁴ that there were

¹ Professor Schaff, the author of this paper, is the grandson of the founder of the American Society of Church History. The appearance of his article in the first number of *Church History* is therefore eminently fitting.

² In the tract *Ein gesprech B. Hübmörs . . . auf Ulrich Zwinglens Taufbüchlen*, Nikolsburg, 1526, Hübmaier says that the term "Anabaptist" (Wiedertäufer) is a misnomer maliciously applied to the brethren by their enemies. It was to the advantage of the enemies of the sect thus to classify its members, for very early in the history of Christendom laws had been passed making it a capital offense to practice rebaptism. *Codex Juris Civilis*, Lib. i, tit. 6, sec. 2, ed. P. Krüger, 1910, p. 60.

³ *Chronikon*, etc., p. 445.

⁴ Heinrich Bullinger: *Der Widertöuffern Ursprung* etc., p. 17.

so many independent sects that many doubted the possibility of naming them all, and he did not suggest in enumeration of the various appearances of the Anabaptists⁵ that there was any definite connection between them. What views two or three groups did hold in common, then, were held independently by each group whether or not such views actually coincided with those held by others.

The rise of these independent groups at this particular time has been accounted for in various ways. As the tempest of the religious revolution swept away from many communities the old Church, the quiet and comfort and reassurance of religious life and influence were not immediately replaced by any new agency. In those regions which rejected the new doctrines of the Reformers, preferring to cling to their old faith, the preachers and missionaries of the new faith suffered persecution and were not permitted to settle in any one place; and even there where the people accepted the Reformation, there was usually considerable confusion as a result. This condition is directly ascribable, in many instances, to a lapse in religious worship and pastoral services; for often the pastors of the old faith, who had been driven out, were not replaced.⁶ Further, the doubt among simple folk as to the truth of the new evangel was heightened by the squabbling and dogmatic quibbling among the real leaders of the Reformation, or among those who were looked upon as such by many people, as for instance, Karlstadt. The result of the airing of differences openly, in public places and through the press, was confusion and bewilderment of serious proportions, especially among the lower and poorer classes. In such circumstances the one comfort which remained to many of these people was the Bible, now in the vernacular and within reach of all; and in every case of doubt in religious respect, each was inclined to support himself by the Scriptures according to his own interpretation. The Evangelicals were themselves largely responsible for this rather dangerous situation through their clear statement of what they considered to be the proper place and method of use of the Bible. They made it practically a duty for each to turn to the Scriptures in order to assure himself of salvation, and in order that he be able to distinguish between true and false doctrines. In consequence of

⁵ Heinrich Bullinger: *Der Widertöuffern Ursprung* etc., pp. 22b ff.

⁶ Thus in April, 1523, the congregation of Kloten repeated former complaints to the effect that they were without a pastor. Egli: *Aktensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation*. p. 359.

the unprecedented dissemination of the Scriptures through the use of the vernacular, it was an easy matter for each to acquaint himself at first hand with at least a part of the Bible; and each, following the urgings and counsel of his own heart, often in preference to the common counsel, was apt to read into the Scriptures, as the single means of salvation left open to him, his own thought to which the wish was often father. The simple minds which reached out for the Bible, were, naturally, affected with the full power of its sublimity of expression, and common reality which surrounded them was, in great measure, forced out of the picture. Small gatherings preferred to meet the problems of salvation without instruction, relying on their own interpretation of the Word.

The rejection of the Catholic faith and authority gave an immense impetus to separatism with its peculiar social doctrines, and this made its strongest appeal to such men as were the chief leaders of the Anabaptist movements, who professed everywhere to see a disparity between the institutions of Christian lands and what they regarded as the plain teachings of Scripture. For them Reformation meant not only the substitution of the teachings of the Reformers for the authority of the Roman hierarchy, but a complete return to the uncorrupted simplicity of the Gospel.

Although Anabaptism was thus on its face primarily religious in its immediate origins, its chief value and interest lay in the protest which Anabaptist groups made against the political order of the time, rather than in the religious principles which they adopted. The Anabaptists found it quite as impossible to continue in the catholic faith as to align themselves definitely with the religion of the Reformers. For in its social relations the Catholic Church had stood for the direct antithesis of such social principles as were integral and vital parts of the Anabaptist programme. The Roman Church, throughout the feudal period, had been the largest individual property owner in Europe, and had ruled the most extensive serfdom. Further, it had been very largely dependent upon its political power for its general life. As regards the Reformers, Luther, Melanchthon, and others had proved bitterly disappointing to the lower classes in the determined and vigorous stand they—the Reformers—had taken against them in the Peasants' War, proving to these simple folk—not necessarily the insurrectionists—that they were completely out of sympathy with the common man, as definitely and completely as had ever been the Catholic Church.

It is true that many of the principles advocated by the various

Anabaptist groups were impossible of permanent, and in some cases, of even temporary fulfillment. Far better, perhaps, that this was so, since there were insurrectionary radicals among them. But it is at the same time undeniable that they played their part in the great struggle which was eventually to culminate in a religious toleration, a condition which is not without its social significance. In consequence of their conception of state and government, the Anabaptists were emphatically opposed to any interference in matters of belief by the government, and were therefore early and outspoken protagonists of the principle of separation of Church and State. They were sometimes forced to an extreme position. They stood, however, generally, for another more spiritual form of religious discipline than is represented in the torture room and on the scaffold. They summed up their complaint against the methods of the civil government in the Zoffingen Disputation, in the observation that the government acted according to the principles not of New Testament or Old Testament law, but in accordance with Roman—that is to say, heathen law.

During the course of the year 1524 the Anabaptists went to a position at the opposite extreme to that already held by what they termed the evangelical half-measures and hesitancy. They formed but a small group opposed to the whole hostile world, but they were willing to testify to their beliefs with their lives if need be. This was a fact not to be forgotten; for it is highly significant of the deep religious conviction which accompanied the intense desire for social changes.

It was the custom for the Reformers and the civil authorities generally to lay against all who came under the general name of Anabaptists the charge of organized resistance to all civil authority and government. From what has already been said it will appear that no such blanket charge could with justice be made. Government documents, except when dealing with isolated cases, are almost invariably without specific evidence to support their accusations. There is almost always to be found a general statement about resistance to and repudiation of the civil authority, no less hostile because vague. The attitude of the government is to be accounted for partly through the belief that the Anabaptist movements were but part of the Peasants' War which had recently been put down with so much bloodshed; and partly through the hostility of the Reformers who represented the Anabaptists in so unfavorable a light. These latter were quick to seize upon vague reports, or upon the radicalism of one small group or individual whose

views may not at all have been characteristic of Anabaptism at its best, and apply their charge to all. Heinrich Bullinger, as an example, writes at length on the Anabaptist views on the civil government, concluding that the general opinion among the sectaries was hostile to the government and against obedience to it, since obedience to heathen, as it were, might be interpreted as traffic in godlessness; he also concluded that they objected to any Christian holding office. He has some damaging evidence. But the presentation of the evidence is biased, and taken, apparently, only from the examples of a few radicals. It is quite plain that Martin Luther in one of his tracts⁷ persisted in confusing the demands of Anabaptists for freedom of worship with the sort of insurrectionary activities against established authority which characterized the Münster affair. Where he did, in the same tract, admit that it was freedom of conscience which the Anabaptists were demanding, he nevertheless insisted that the government is obliged to punish them just as it would punish blasphemers.⁸ For in his opinion, the doctrines of the Anabaptists cannot be anything but false doctrines.

The fact of the matter is, if an unbiased survey be made of the views on civil government as held by the disconnected groups and individuals in various parts of Europe, it will be seen that their views, as compared with those of the Reformers themselves, were not in the main radical or insurrectionary. What is more, there is so much similarity between the views of some of the Reformers on civil government and those of the Anabaptists that one is induced to believe that it was probably from the Reformers that the Anabaptists learned, or at least to them that they looked for support.

The Reformers were concerned for the unity of their new church. They looked upon the Anabaptist movement as a potential disrupting force, and it was, perhaps, natural under the circumstances that they opposed them as they did. The view presented by this paper is that what the Anabaptists, taken generally, demanded was not the abolition of government, but freedom to worship as

⁷ "Das weltliche oberkeit den Wiedertäufern mit leiblicher Strafe-zu wehren". Weimar edition of Luther's *Works*, Vol. 50, pp. 6-16.

⁸ Ibid. p. 11. "Zum andern haben die W. artickel, die geistlich sachen belangen,— von solchen geistlichen Artickeln ist das auch unser antwort: Wie die weltlich oberkeit schuldig ist, öffentliche Gotteslesterung, *blasphemias* und *peniuria* zu wehren und zu straffen, also ist sie schuldig öffentliche falsche leer, unrechte Gottesdienst und ketzereien jm eignen gebieten und personen darüber sie zu gebieten hat, zu wehren und zu straffen"

they pleased, insisting that the government had no right to coerce them in matters of faith. It would therefore appear that the Reformers gravely misjudged and misrepresented them. But before proceeding to a discussion of views held by widely scattered Anabaptists, it will be instructive, for purposes of comparison, to examine the written opinions of some of the Reformers on exactly this question.

In 1523 Luther had announced that every common man had the right to judge of religious teaching and to set up and put down preachers and teachers. There was no need to concern oneself with the laws of men, whether such laws emanated from the pope or emperor, or whether they had been in force a single year or a thousand. According to the received laws and customs of the age, the bishops and councils alone were empowered to sit in judgment upon teachings. But Christ, it was reasoned, had taken such power from them when He said: "The sheep follow him (the shepherd): for they know his voice. And a stranger they will not follow, but will flee from him; for they know not the voice of strangers. . . . All that came before me are thieves and robbers, but the sheep did not hear them."⁹ "Here," said Luther, "you see plainly whose right it is to judge of teaching. Bishops, popes, and learned men have the right to teach, but the sheep are to judge whether these men are teaching the Word of Christ, or whether they teach with a strange voice."¹⁰ "Bishops, councils and the like act against the express commandment of Christ in taking over judgment concerning matters of this nature, and we all see by this that tyrants who rule over us in a manner contrary to God's will are to be driven out of Christendom like wolves and thieves."¹¹

Already in 1520 Luther had written that nothing external, no matter what it may be, can touch the freedom of a man's faith. Nothing external—physical imprisonment, food or drink—can reach to the soul to either free or take it captive, or to make it good or bad.¹² A Christian man is raised by his faith so high above all other considerations of life that he becomes spiritual master over all things. And Luther referred to the teaching in Romans viii, where Paul gives as his opinion that everything, whatever it may be, must be made by the elect to serve their best interests

⁹ John x, 4-8.

¹⁰ "Dass eine Christliche Versammlung Recht und Macht habe, alle Lehre zu untertheilen," 1523. Weimar ed: Vol. 11, pp. 401 ff.

¹¹ Ibid. P. 210.

¹² *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen*, 1520. Weimar ed: Vol. 7, pp. 12 ff.

spiritually.¹³ In this tract on civil government Luther writes in words which bear so great similarity to the arguments of the Anabaptists as to be almost identical. He first adduced scriptural proof¹⁴ that the civil government is right and good and established by God. "All authority is from God. He who opposes such authority, opposes the command of God. But *who opposes God's commands, he will draw down upon himself damnation.*"¹⁵ In what he called the main argument of the sermon (Das Hauptstück dieses Sermons), Luther considered how far the authority of the civil government is to extend.¹⁶ It is most important to determine this, said he, in order to prevent its extending too far, and thus infringing upon God in His Kingdom. For God will permit none to rule over the soul beside Himself. From this it follows that the government, in attempting to rule over us in spiritual matters, "forces our souls into everlasting death, with such impious commands."¹⁷ Therefore, in matters touching the salvation of the soul nothing is to be taught or accepted but God's own Word. No one may take the place of another in either Heaven or Hell; no more may anyone coerce another to belief or unbelief. It must be a matter for the conscience of each individual.¹⁸ Now if a prince, or another in authority, said Luther, commanded to hold with the pope, or to believe thus and thus, he is to be answered to the effect that it is not seemly for Lucifer to sit next to God. "Dear lord, I owe you obedience with body and goods; command me according to the measure of your earthly power, and I will obey."¹⁹

There has already been cited an opinion of Luther that the government is obliged to punish false teaching. But in the tract on the civil government he takes a different line. "Do you say again," said he, "but civil authority does not coerce in matters of faith; it simply takes external precautions so that no one be mis-

¹³ Ibid. p. 27.

¹⁴ *Von Weltlicher Oberkeit, wie weit man ihr Gehorsam schuldig sei*, 1523. Weimar ed. Vol. 11, pp. 229 ff.

¹⁵ Ibid. p. 247, "Wer sich aber der Ordnung Gottes widersetzt der wird sich die Verdammnis zuziehen."

¹⁶ Ibid. p. 261, *Der Zweite Teil.*

¹⁷ Ibid. "Daraus folget denn, dass weltliche Gewalt die Seelen zum ewigen Tode dränget mit solchem frevelhaften Gebot."

¹⁸ *Von Weltlicher Oberkeit* etc., pp. 263, 264. "Weil es denn einem jeglichen auf seinem Gewissen liegt, wie er glaubt oder nicht glaubt, und geschieht damit der weltlichen Gewalt durchaus kein Abbruch."

¹⁹ Ibid. p. 257.

led by false teaching; or how else could one guard against heresy? Answer: That is a matter for the bishops, to them has been given authority in these matters, and not to the prince. For heresy may never be guarded against with force."²⁰ The comparison is an interesting one. Compare also his reply to the theologians of Louvain,²¹ where he again definitely stated that matters of belief are not to be interfered with by princes or kings. They are not even to confirm what they believe to be the proper faith. On the other hand, Luther's doctrine of the priesthood of all believers is not to be forgotten, especially when presented in so strong a form as it assumes in the *Address to the German Nobility*.²² Here he gave it as his opinion that where members of the laity are alone in a desert place (Wuestenei) without a proper minister (which, be it observed, was the feeling of the Anabaptists), the services which they perform, including baptism, are to be considered valid, "which would not be the case were we not all priests."

Of the other Reformers whose opinions may be cited, Ulrich Zwingli perhaps deserves first place because of his early connection with the Anabaptists in Zürich. In one of his early tracts he definitely stated that those have not the true faith who believe that God's Word is not to be preached except within the limitations imposed by human justice and magistracy.²³ Again, in his writing on the calling and office of the minister of God he deposed that belief and faith come only from the spirit of God, and that those who have this faith look upon it and upon the will of God, according to their understanding of it, as their only standard of conduct.²⁴ The wording of these two statements is almost identical with what may repeatedly be found to be the belief of the Anabaptists.

Wolfgang Musculus asserted that where the eternal was concerned, no Christian could with good conscience permit an un-

²⁰ Ibid. p. 268. ". . . denn der Ketzerei kann man nimmermehr mit Gewalt wehren."

²¹ *Contra xxxii articulos Lovaniensium theologistarum*. Weimar ed. Vol. 54. Art. lxxiii, p. 430 (also 443 in the German ed.) "Non est regum aut principium etiam veram Doctrinam confirmare, sed ei subici et servire, ut Paul ij dicitur: Et nunc, reges, intellegite, Erudimini, Iudices terrae."

²² *An den Christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des Christlichen standes Besserung*, 1520. Weimar ed. Vol. 6, p. 407.

²³ "Von der göttlichen und menschlichen Gerechtigkeit oder von dem göttlichen Gesetze und den bürgerlichen Gesetzen". In R. Christoffel: *Huldreich Zwingli, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften*, p. 329.

²⁴ "Von dem Berufe und dem Amte des Verkündigers des göttlichen Wortes." Same publication pp. 163 ff., p. 290. "Der Glaube aber kommt wie wir oben dargestan haben, allein vom Geiste Gottes. Die aber den Glauben haben, sehen bis jeglichen Werke auf dem Willen Gottes als auf ihre einzige Richtschnur."

reasonable (unbillich) earthly authority to meddle. Not only so, but there is not upon earth a power strong enough to interfere effectively in such matters. "For this depends entirely upon the will and the deed of the Christian, and not on the action of the authorities."²⁵ Similarly Johann Brentius²⁶ felt that it is not proper for the civil government to coerce or to burden the conscience of Christians. However, said he, naturally all of the Anabaptists and heretics will look upon their own doctrine as the right one, and such a state of affairs is not to be countenanced for a minute. Somewhat like him, Urbanus Rhegius answered a question to the effect that the civil power shall have the authority to interfere in matters of faith where it is a case of erring faith.²⁷ It is amusing to us to see the confidence with which these men so naively assumed their own infallibility in matters of faith.

In entering upon a discussion of the Anabaptists themselves, it will be well, as a precautionary measure, to begin by pointing out that there were two distinct views among them regarding the place and authority of the civil government. To the first party—much the smaller and less important, and therefore not to be taken as a standard of measurement for all the groups—belonged the more radical spirits whose visionary plans and chiliastic activities proved that their theory imperilled the established order of the state. Others, less extreme, were ambiguous in their statements. But the great mass of the Anabaptists were moderates, and what has been characterized as their determination to overthrow established government, was actually nothing more than a determination to secure from the government freedom of worship. Having made this admission, we may now go on to an examination of the views of those Anabaptists who made up the larger and more important groups.

Zürich was the cradle of the Anabaptist movement, and the first members of the sect there were men who had at one time been associated with Ulrich Zwingli in his program of reformation of the church. They became disaffected by reason of Zwingli's slowness in effecting a complete break with the old church, and

²⁵ "Wie weit ein Christ Schuldig seye Gewalt zu leiden", in *Consiliorum Theologorum*, etc. ed. Felix Bidnenbach, 1612, p. 53.

²⁶ "Ob eine Obrigkeit wenn sie falsche Lehr ausrottet, darumb über die Gewissen herrsche, und ob Obrigkeit die irrgen wider jr Gewissen können zu andern Glauben gezwungen werden." *Consiliorum Theologicorum*, etc., p. 420.

²⁷ "Ob die Obrigkeit die irrgen im Glauben in ihren Landen und Gebieten möge mit Gewalt und straff von Irrtumb dringen", etc., *Con. Theol.* etc., p. 424. "Deshalb antworte ich auff diese Frag affirmative."

because of his habit of deferring to the City Council in final decisions. The first disagreement between Grebel—who was to become the leader of the Anabaptists in Zürich—and Zwingli was on the question of the mass, which was discussed at the second Zürich Disputation on October 26, 1523. The root of this initial disagreement, however, lay much deeper than the mass. Throughout his career as a reformer, Zwingli had not been sufficiently biblical for Grebel. The latter accused the older man of limiting the Word of God, and it was quite intolerable to him²⁸ that Zwingli left decisions on church matters to the City Council. Others expressed the opinion that the power to decide on such matters had never been delegated to the civil government. "You have not the authority," said Simon Stumpf, giving utterance to this sentiment, "to refer the decision to the gentlemen of the Council; the decision has already been made; the Spirit of God has given the decision."

I have mentioned Konrad Grebel as the real leader of the Anabaptist movement in Zürich. Turning first to his views, therefore, on the civil government, it is to be observed that Zwingli²⁹ accepted it as perfectly clear from a disputation in which Grebel had taken part that the intention of the Anabaptists was to increase their numbers to the point where they could rid themselves of established government. On the other hand, Grebel himself stated³⁰ before the examiners that he had never said to Dr. Sebastian Hoffmeister of Schaffhausen that the civil power should be done away with. In July of 1525 Grebel petitioned the Zürich government for a safe conduct that he might come to Zürich to dispute with Zwingli, thus recognizing the actually effective, if not the theoretical authority of the Council, both by his action and by the wording of the petition. For he distinctly said in the document that he was willing and prepared to obey the Council in every respect touching matters coming under their jurisdiction.³¹ That he denied the jurisdiction of the civil power in matters of faith is clear, however, from his answers during examination to pertinent

²⁸ Grebel to Vadian, July 13th, 1523. *Vadianische Briefsammlung der Stadtbibliothek St. Gallen*. Ed. Emil Arbens.

²⁹ "Aussage über die Widertäuffer vor den Nachgängern"; Egli, *Aktensammlung*; No. 692.

³⁰ "Conrad Grebels Verantwortung vor den Nachgängern"; Egli, *Aktensamm.* No. 692.

³¹ "Hiermit nichts mehr dann wir euch unsren Herren in allerley weltlichen, dienstlichen Händeln mit Gehorsame dienen können, so sind wir willig und bereit dazu." Conrad Grebels und Marx Bossarts Bittschrift an den grossen Rath etc., in Füssli, *Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Kirchenreformation*, etc., Vol. ii, p. 368.

questions to the effect that he would stand steadfastly by Anabaptism and believed firmly that he was right; but he said again, that he would otherwise render obedience to the government in all things worldly.³²

Associated with Grebel in his work in Zürich were Felix Manz³³ and Georg Blaurock.³⁴ Of the former, Sebastian Hoffmeister of Schaffhausen reported to the Zürich authorities³⁵ that "he had spoken with him, and he had said that there ought not to be a civil government," and Manz himself, when questioned by the Zürich authorities concerning his conversation with Hoffmeister, admitted that the report was partly true.³⁶ But in partial contradiction to the evidence against him, Manz later answered the questions of the examiners to the effect that he had never wished to do away with the government.³⁷ As to Georg Blaurock, in spite of his protests to the contrary, he was known as a turbulent and dangerous agitator against civil authority.³⁸ It was his claim that he had taught nothing derogatory concerning the government, but rather that we are to follow Paul's advice to serve in the government ourselves. It does seem to be the fact, from the major part of the evidence, that Blaurock concerned himself with the more passive elements of the Anabaptist system but little. His every activity is made to appear factious and inflammatory. And yet, in the final analysis, Blaurock learned his lessons from Grebel. Some of Grebel's statements regarding the civil government may have been thought deliberately vague and ambiguous, and those made to the authorities by him unlike those made to his disciples. Such an assumption, however, seems dangerous in the light of Grebel's otherwise straightforward character.

³² "Bericht der Nachgänger vor dem Rath zu Zürich", Füssli, *Beiträge* iii, p. 212.

³³ Felix Manz who, like Grebel, was a native of Zürich was a son of a canon of the Great Minster there. He was a scholarly man and had become an accomplished Hebraist under the tutelage of Copernicus. He seems to have early associated himself with Zwingli (Bullinger: *Reformationsgesch.*, I, 30) and was prominent, with Grebel and Reublin at the first disputation with the Anabaptists on Jan. 18th, 1525. He proved a valuable man for the Anabaptist cause, for he possessed evangelical gifts of a high order.

³⁴ The renegade monk, Georg vom Hause Jakob in Chur, who was called Blaurock from the color of his clothing. He was considerably more reckless than Grebel or Manz.

³⁵ "Aussage über die Wiedertäuffer vor den Nachgängern", Füssli, *Beiträge*, I, p. 242. Also, Egli: *Aktensammlung*, No. 692.

³⁶ "Felix Mantzen Verantwortung vor den Nachgängern". Füssli, *Beiträge*, I, p. 254.

³⁷ Täuferprozess. In Egli: *Aktensammlung*, No. 692, pp. 310, 313. ". . . er habe die obrigkeit nie besiegen wollen."

³⁸ Egli: *Aktensammlung*, No. 692.

An Anabaptist leader of great importance was Balthasar Hübmaier. While he became more important after his departure to Moravia, he nevertheless was won over to the Anabaptist cause while yet in Switzerland. In Zürich, in March, 1526, he was examined by Burgomaster and council, and declared that "In the second place it occurs to me that I am suspected of repudiating the civil authority, and saying that a Christian may not become a magistrate. In this I am wronged. I have always said, a Christian may very well become a magistrate, and the more Christian he is, the more honourably will he rule. This I have proved with many writings of which I do not now recall the names."³⁹ This in spite of an annotation to a Täuferprozess in Zürich on January 13, 1526, to the effect that "Doctor Balthasar had gredt:man möge der oberkeit niendertmit bas abkommen, dann mit dem widertouf. Zwingli."⁴⁰ The statement attributed to Zwingli does not necessarily invalidate the confession cited above.

Until recently it has been thought that Hübmaier was greatly influenced in his political views by Thomas Müntzer. Stern, in his *Ueber die zwölf Artikel der Bauern*, was especially favorable to this opinion, largely influenced thereto by Heinrich Bullinger and Ottius. But Wilhelm Mau⁴¹ denies that such influence was exerted. In determining the source of the influence which worked upon Hübmaier, Mau turns to Zürich. In Waldshut, Hübmaier had prosecuted the work of reform in close association with Zwingli and his co-workers, and the source of this influence may be traced to Zwingli's *Usslegung und Grund der 67 Schlussreden*, etc.⁴² In the forty-second article of this tract Zwingli, speaking of civil rulers and their duties says, after declaring that they are to be obeyed in all things so long as they do not command what God forbids, that when they are unfaithful and refuse to follow Christ's rule, they may be deposed. So Hübmaier, following this counsel to a logical conclusion, had taught in his 18 *Schlussreden so betreffend ein Christliche leben*, published in 1524, that as every Christian believes and is baptized for himself, so each is to judge for himself what the meaning of the Scriptures is, and whether he is properly taught by his pastor.

³⁹ Egli: *Aktensammlung*, p. 449. Cf. also Ottius: *Annales Anabaptistici*, where he reports Hübmaier as writing to the Zürich Council, "Neq unquam statui Christiani non posse Magistratum", etc.

⁴⁰ Egli: *Aktensammlung*, p. 429.

⁴¹ Balthasar Hübmaier, p. 44. Berlin, 1912.

⁴² Zwingli's *Works. Corpus Reformatorum.*, Vol. ii, pp. 342-396.

Let us look hastily at the views of one or two of the rank and file of the movement as it appeared in Zürich.

In a hearing at Zürich in March of 1525, Välatin Gredig testified that it had never occurred to him to fight against the civil power or to say that it should be done away with, for he knew right well the necessity for a magistracy.⁴³ Rudolph and Jakob Hottinger, both of whom figured in the same process, had slightly differing views on government. The former admitted that the institution of the civil authority was right and just; the latter, while he pronounced himself unready to make a definite statement, did hold that the government might have no authority in matters of faith, for faith was and of right should be quite free to anyone.⁴⁴

The views of the Zürich Anabaptists may be taken as representative of those held throughout Switzerland by the moderates who were in the majority. But it may be as well to consider briefly opinions expressed in some other of the larger cities.

From the summer of 1526 on references to the Anabaptists from the country about Basel begin to appear with considerable regularity in the records of those arrested and examined. Before the establishment of the Reformation in Basel, the attitude of the city government towards the Anabaptists seems to have been one almost of tolerance; certainly it was in actual fact mild, and the reason for this was that until the establishment of the Reformation, the all important question to be decided upon in Basel was that between the old faith and the reformed. It was, then, not until February, 1529, when the Protestant Reformation was adopted by civil decree, that the new state church was in a position to proceed against Anabaptism in a determined manner.

There had been Anabaptists in the city since quite early, however. In August, 1525, an Anabaptist brother clearly declared his stand on the civil authority during the first disputation held between the preachers of Basel and the members of the new sect. What he said at this meeting has been recorded with Oecolampadius' counter arguments,⁴⁵ the latter having been one of the participants in the meeting. The Anabaptist Carlin's proposition regarding the civil government was: "The magistracy has been established by God. But so soon as it becomes active beyond the

⁴³ Egli: *Aktensammlung*, No. 674.

⁴⁴ Egli, *Aktensammlung*, No. 762.

⁴⁵ *Unterrichtung von dem Widertauff etc., auf Carlin N. Widertauffers artickel.* Carlin's articles are also preserved by themselves in manuscript in the *Criminalia* in Basel. I; B. C.

command and authorization of Christ, then it is not Christian and men are not obliged to obey it." Oecolampadius seems almost to have made himself ridiculous by the means which he employed for the purpose of refuting Carlin. "Furthermore," said he, "Carlin has said: 'So soon as the government becomes active beyond the commands and spirit of Christ it ceases to be Christian.' Does he here mean that whatever is not expressly mentioned by Christ, but is still not contrary to the Word of God, is un-Christian? It must follow such reasoning that, if a father told his child to go to sleep, or any such thing not touching the soul, but of practical concern, if he had not the express Word of God for that, he would not be Christian."

In the archives of yet another city of Switzerland, Bern, is to be found a document without definite heading, but which is obviously a set of statutes written for the governance of the Bern Brethren. It is anonymous.⁴⁶ It is also significant that the *Seven Articles of Schlatten* are also to be found in the archives; and the deduction must necessarily be that they were probably the first extensive constitution adopted and followed by the Bern Anabaptists.⁴⁷ The *Seven Articles* are moderate in tone, and not very different in content from the opinions we have already been considering. They were drawn up on February 26th, 1527. In a conference held on May 21st of that year, where a number of Anabaptists seem to have been examined more as prisoners than anything else, the first of them admitted obedience to the civil government to be just and right.⁴⁸ The second, a Peter Breit, also said that he would be obedient to the civil government "mit lyb und gut" when it did not conflict in its commands with the will of God. A third agreed with him, and a certain Bastian went somewhat further in asserting his belief that not only could the government very well be Christian, and Christians magistrates, but the more Christian the magistrate was the better. However, if the officer acted sinfully, we must even then be obedient and look upon the evil tyranny as just punishment from God. In a Sendbrieff of approximately the same period, an anonymous writer complains that people are saying of the Anabaptists that they want to do away with the govern-

⁴⁶ Staatsarchiv des Kantons Bern. U. P. 80, No. 4.

⁴⁷ Staatsarchiv des Kantons Bern. U. P. No. 80. The copy (No. 8) in Bern is in the same handwriting—a mixture of Latin and German script—as the statutes above referred to. They are to be found printed in Beck: *Geschichtsbücher der Wiedertäufer*. P. 144.

⁴⁸ Gespräch, May 21st, 1527. Staatsarchiv des Kantons Bern. U. P. 80.

ment "daran uns gwalt und unrecht geschicht." For they know that the government was established by God in order that men may live in peace and harmony with one another.⁴⁹

At the Disputation at Zoffingen⁵⁰ between a number of leading Anabaptists and several evangelical preachers, including Caspar Megander, Berchtold Haller, Heinrichus Lincki, and others, the discussion on the civil government was long and detailed. The Anabaptists began by admitting that there should be a magistracy on earth, established by God, and that one must pay taxes and assessments to it. It was said to exist for the purposes of punishment and protection, and one must be obedient to it so far as it is in harmony with the Gospel.

If we leave Switzerland and follow the Anabaptist movement to other sections of Europe, we find that in Austria, first of all, there congregated a number of quite radical spirits; and they were enabled by the toleration given them in Moravia to work out theories which were more radical than those appearing in some other places. We do find here opposition to the civil government as a Christian institution. But in spite of this fact it may be assumed that the rank and file of the people were not insurrectionary.

The first leader of the Anabaptists in Moravia was Balthasar Hübmaier, who, after fleeing from Zürich, made his way to Nikolsburg. In his *Kurtze Entschuldigung*⁵¹ Hübmaier referred to the accusations against him dating from his troubles in Switzerland, that he was a seditious person. He justified his activities while in Waldshut, and denied that he had been unpatriotic. He further conceded all honor and authority to the civil government, and expressly favored the payment of tithes and taxes, but said: ". . . that I am accused of being a seditious person, thank God, it is the same name that was given to Christ my Saviour."

Jorg Dorsch, who was baptized in 1527 by Ludwig Hetzer and went from Nürnberg to Krämt-Patheyn, answered in an examination in 1528 before the authorities that he knew nothing of any hostilities to the civil government among the Anabaptists⁵². Another, Hans Nadler, who had been in Moravia, and who was

⁴⁹ *Staatsarchiv des Kantons Bern*, U. P. 80, No. 6.

⁵⁰ *Acta gehaltener Disputation und Gespräch zu Zoffingen im Berner Biet mit den Widertöuffern*. Geschehen am ersten tag Iulii, in 1532.

⁵¹ Nikolsburg, 1526.

⁵² *Mährisches Landesarchiv*, Brünn. Beck Coll. No. 72. "Item Jorg Dorsch von Wihszheim ist sambstag zunechst gutlich besprocht worden und auff bey liegende articol wie volgt bekhangt, Anno etc. xxviii."

seized in 1528 in Erlangen, answered a question put to him in a trial, that he believed it necessary to have established government and that all such was founded by God whether it be good or bad. Personally he was not hostile to the authorities, for it is unseemly for a Christian to quarrel be it with any person or institution. He referred to the wish of many of the Brethren to lay aside all arms and opposition to the civil government in this respect, but held that although he himself had followed this rule, it depended in each case entirely on the strength of one's faith whether one should do so or not.⁵³ A number of the Brethren who seem to have been seized and taken to Trieste for imprisonment and trial gave it as their united opinion that it was just and right to pay to the civil authorities taxes and tithes and other assessments, and to obey them in other matters.⁵⁴ Another, Claus Felbinger, at a later time, in a prison in Bavaria, deposed that the Anabaptists were willing to subject themselves to civil government except in things which are contrary to their faith and convictions. Such things they would refuse to do, not out of defiance or pride, but because of the pure fear of God.⁵⁵

That all of the Moravian sectaries stood for freedom of conscience scarcely needs to be repeated. Their very existence and their adherence to Anabaptism involves this fact. God does not accept a forced belief or faith, so Claus Felbinger declared,⁵⁶ but loves a willing heart. Salvation is not bound to any one land or place, for the Word of God may not be bound. He who fears God and does right is acceptable to Him.

As it was in Switzerland and Moravia, so it was in various parts of Germany proper. Considering first Bavaria, the authorities of Passau at first gave most attention to religious matters, but later were interested in other questions as well. In 1531 Lienhart Stiegling was questioned concerning his views with respect to civil government, and denied that a pact existed among the Anabaptists which had for its purpose attacking any established institution.⁵⁷ Sebastian Eck, in Ingolstadt, received instructions from

⁵³ *Mährisches Landesarchiv*, Brünn; Beck Coll. No. 72. Anno Domini m15 und im 29.—“Antbort Hanssen Nadlers des gefangen zu Erlangen . . . wye hernach volgt.”

⁵⁴ Ms. 338 kt., p. 44b. In the archives of the Evangelischen Gemeinden in Pressburg.

⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 50 b.

⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 59b.

⁵⁷ Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich. (Passau). Passau Akten, No. 38 (2). p. 83.

Munich for the examination of seized Brethren, and important among the questions to be put to them was one regarding their intentions, supposed or real, of rising against the magistracy.⁵⁸ The examinations conducted by Eck, however, seem to have revealed no seditious purpose of this kind.

In Nürnberg and the vicinity, far more than in and about Munich, did the Anabaptists have to answer for their radical social views. Hans Hut, who seems to have been subjected to an examination by the Nürnberg authorities in October, 1527, expressed himself in a different manner than he had done during his turbulent career in Moravia. He deposed that according to his belief there should be a civil government among Christians, and that all power and authority came from God; that he knew of no undertaking against established government, and that there existed no bond among the Anabaptists of a social or political nature.⁵⁹ In a formula sent to Nürnberg from Ansbach—for examination of Anabaptists—two interesting questions were prescribed with an argument to be used with each.⁶⁰ One was why it was their definite purpose to exterminate civil government. The first to be examined was a certain Julius Lober⁶¹ from Zürich. Lober called God to witness that he had no desire whatever to act in a manner calculated to lead to the downfall of government, or to a general disobedience to it. For he recognized that civil government was of divine appointment. He declared that he had no intention of being himself disobedient to the authorities, but rather that his sole purpose was to stand by his belief and obey God rather than man.

Further examinations of the Brethren which revealed a favorable attitude toward established government were those of Ambros. Spitlmayr⁶² who asserted that nothing was further from the thoughts of the Anabaptists than sedition; and of Wolfgang Wuest⁶³ who held that government is established by God and is to be obeyed. Wuest believed, however, that the civil powers had nothing to do with matters of belief or the soul's salvation, and positively denied any knowledge of a conspiracy against the civil

⁵⁸ Hauptstaatsarchiv, Munich. Staatsverwaltung 347.

⁵⁹ Bay. Staatsarchiv, Nürnberg. Repertorium 81, p. 125, No. 6.

⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 26, No. 9.

⁶¹ Ibid. Pt. iii, p. 3b.

⁶² Bayerisches Staatsarchiv, Nürnberg. Ansbacher Religions acta. Tom. xxxviii. p. 15.

⁶³ Bayerisches Staatsarchiv, Nürnberg. Ansbacher Religions acta. Tom. xxxviii. p. 286.

authorities, nobility, or priests. Further, a letter from Cadolzburg to the Statthalter at Ansbach (Anolsbach) reported that even under torture no Anabaptist in Ansbach could be made to admit having any seditious intentions against the government.⁶⁴

The fair land of Hessen seems generally, perhaps because of the quiet and easy character of its people, perhaps because of its relative remoteness during the Reformation period, to have escaped insurrectionary infection. In the archives in the old castle in Marburg is a most interesting document containing an Anabaptist platform. It seems to be anonymous. Concerning the civil government its writer states most definitely that: "We believe that the office and power of the government are of and from God. But it must be used as God directs, for the protection of the good and the punishment of evil."⁶⁵ There is a fairly lengthy discussion following this statement, most moderate in tone. As for others, Balschazzar Kande, pastor at Hersfeld, described a conference in Kassel, of no great importance except that one man suspected of Anabaptism was examined, the examination eliciting the information that he held no radical views on government. He said that he believed in giving to the government what belonged to it; to God what was His.⁶⁶ A document of late 1546 or early 1547 mentions three Anabaptists, without giving any names, who were also examined by this man Balschazzar. About the civil government, whether it should be given its due, one of them replied that he knew of no debt to anyone but God. But if anyone did owe anything to the government, he should pay it.⁶⁷

Although such expressions as "verfuerisch" and the like often occur in documents referring to the Anabaptists in Hesse, relatively little is said of social disturbances. And where spoken of at all, it is very general, as in letters from the Landgrave or other officials, and not information elicited in trials. The Synods of 1577 and 1578, for instance, have absolutely nothing specific to say of the social errors of the Anabaptists, although they do make a veiled reference to them.⁶⁸

⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 109.

⁶⁵ Staatsarchiv, Marburg a/L. Kirchensachen. Abhandlungen und Gutachten (Untertitelt) O. St. S 5451.

⁶⁶ Marburg. Staatsarchiv. O. St. S 34 Be. Akten des Staathaltes und der Räte in Kassel. 1536-1547. p. 23. No date.

⁶⁷ Ibid. p. 25.

⁶⁸ Marburg. Staatsarchiv. Extractes der Synodorum zu Cassel etc. O. St. s. 34 Be. See also Synods of 1571, '72, '73, '74, '79, '86, '. Vol. I. 13.

What is true of Hesse is true also of the land about Weimar. There are the usual vague references to violence rumoured or contemplated by Anabaptists, without specific information. On the other hand, to select a few examples from a good number; a preacher, Christoff Mueller of Schneeberg, has left for us three "Supplicationes," which are preserved in the archives in Weimar. In these he defends his teachings, and his stand on civil government, asserting that he is not radical, but that he honors and fears the magistracy.⁶⁹ The fact concerning this good man is that apparently his personal appearance was calculated to excite greater suspicion than his views. For according to a manuscript description, "the same preacher is said to wear red hose with yellow lining; a blue surcoat with yellow scallops, and fine sleeves; a great gray cap with long tassels behind, and in front hanging bands which are to be put inside the belt, and these tassels are of many colours."⁷⁰

Of disciples who were examined during a hearing under Eberhard von der Thann in 1533, the first declared the magistracy to be established by God and that obedience must be rendered it. One of those examined felt that a Christian could not with good conscience become a government official, but must obey magistrates. Practically all examined voted obedience to the government, but declared that they would resist being coerced into returning to the old church.⁷¹ A striking example of just how many of these simple brethren felt towards the government is to be found in the testimony of one man who declared that had the officials permitted him to remain by his own faith, he would have gladly done whatever else had been required of him.⁷²

Paul Wappler, in his admirable book,⁷³ has sufficiently treated the section about Dresden. It may be said, briefly, that what were found to be the conditions in other parts of Germany also obtained there. One example may be given, that of a certain Hans Höhne of Seehausen who deposed that he believed in rendering to Caesar those things which were due him. But while he was

⁶⁹ Sächsisch Ernst. Gesamtarchiv, Weimar. Reg. N. 35-c. No. 16, 1. p. 138.

⁷⁰ Sächs. Ernst. Gesamtarchiv, Weimar. Reg. N. 998. Schriften betr. die Wiedertäufer in Erfurtischen Gebiete. 1527.

⁷¹ Sächs. Ernst. Gesamtarchiv, Weimar. Reg. N. 991. Schriften betr. das Verhör der . . . von der Thann. 1523.

⁷² Sächs. Ernst. G'arch. Weimar. Reg. 1009, 1536, p. 12. "Wann aber seine Oberkeit unter der er gewohnt Yhm hette bey seinem glaubenn pleybenn lassenn, so wolt er getan haben was man gefordert hatte."

⁷³ Die Täuferbewegung in Thüringen von 1526-1584. Jena 1913.

willing to give to the government its due, he refused to be ruled by the authorities in things of God.⁷⁴

The opponents of the Anabaptists have made considerable capital of the fact that those who, after arrest, were released upon oath to avoid connection with the Brethren in the future and to remain faithful to the Church, broke their oath. This is not unintelligible. In the first place, there were many who felt that it was sinful to swear, and they had ample precedent for breaking oaths which had been forced from them. In the second place, the shame they felt and the bitter remorse at having wavered in their faith because of fear of men, would help to explain their action. The further demands of the Council that they harbor no member of the sect within their houses drove many an Anabaptist back into the waiting arms of his brethren.

The attempt has been made to set forth clearly that the important demand made by the Anabaptists in almost every case where groups were to be found was for freedom of conscience and for toleration by the civil power of any creed. Many of the Anabaptists believed that faith cannot be induced through the medium of any writing—even the Bible—or of preaching, but that it must come directly from the “inner Word” of God, true and living, as when God speaks to our hearts and illuminates our souls as with a bright light, and presses Himself into us as with a seal; thus the inner man may know what he believes better than the outer man can perceive with his physical senses what to believe. For the outer man may be deceived by pretence and false appearances.⁷⁵ These held that the preachers of their times might not with justice avail themselves of the services of the civil government in matters touching religion and belief. For in the Church none but the spiritual sword might be used; for if the magistrates are permitted to have authority in matters of faith, then religion and faith are in the position of being subordinated to the judgment of mere man: and when this happens the offices in Church and State, which must be essentially different, become mixed to the resulting disorder of both.⁷⁶ Christ simply commanded us to preach the Gospel, not to attempt to force anyone to a belief in Him. It would be right difficult for us, said the Anabaptists, to force all Jews, Turks, and heathen to accept Christianity.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Sächs. Hauptstaatsarchiv, Dresden. Relig. Sachen, iii, 113. 10328. Wiedertäuffer bet.

⁷⁵ Sebastian Franck: *Chronikon* etc., p. 451.

⁷⁶ Heinrich Bullinger: *Der Widertöüffern Ursprung* etc., p. 149.

⁷⁷ Ibid. p. 165.

AMONG THE MEMBERS

Professor Roland H. Bainton of the Yale Divinity School has completed in manuscript more than half of a volume to be entitled *Religious Liberty in Calvin's Day*. In the meantime, he has published some preparatory articles. Two have recently appeared, namely, *Sebastian Castellio and the Toleration Controversy of the Sixteenth Century*, in *Persecution and Liberty Essays in Honor of George Lincoln Burr*. Another article on *Servetus and Colombo* appeared in *Sudhoffs Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin*, Heft 3 and 4, 1931. An article on *William Postell and the Netherlands* will shortly appear in *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, and another one on *The Present State of Servetus Studies* will appear in the *Journal of Modern History* for March, 1932.

Professor J. Minton Batten of Scarritt College of Nashville, Tennessee, served during the Summer Quarter of 1931 as a visiting professor of history at George Peabody College for Teachers.

Professors S. J. Case and W. D. Schermerhorn are engaged in an important service in the field of church history. As official representatives of the American Society of Church History, they are paying a visit to the schools of higher Christian learning in Japan, China, India, Burma, and the Philippines, in order both to stimulate the study of church history in these institutions and to collect materials for the writing of the history of the newer churches. They are in quest of books, pamphlets, periodicals, official reports, and manuscript materials of various kinds which form the records of the rising Christian life of these countries. While abroad, they are holding many conferences with teachers and leaders, and addressing churches and other gatherings. They are accompanied by Professor Edward Morgan of Selly Oak, England. The work was undertaken at the suggestion of Dr. John R. Mott, who conferred with a committee of the American Society of Church History on the matter in December, 1930, and has since secured considerable financial aid for the undertaking. The commissioners are expected back by the latter part of March.

Professor Paul N. Garber, of the School of Religion of Duke University, obtained a leave of absence during the Spring semester in order to devote himself to research on the topic "Religion in the South Since the Civil War". He expects to have the volume published in the near future.

Besides his professional duties, Professor Milton J. Hoffman, of the New Brunswick Theological Seminary, serves as president of the New Brunswick World Court Committee.

Professor Elmer S. Johnson, of the Hartford Theological Seminary, has brought out, with the help of an editorial staff, volume eleven of *Corpus Schwenkfeldianorum*. Volumes twelve and thirteen are in the press.

Professor M. M. Knappen, of the Church History Department of the University of Chicago, spent the summer of 1931 in England, working on the history of English Puritanism.

Professor C. H. Moehlman, of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, has contributed a number of articles to periodicals as well as to the new Collier's *Religious Encyclopedia*. He expects to publish within the near future two new books, namely, *The Evolution of the Apostles' Creed*, and *St. Pilate, a Study in Christian Ethics*.

Professor Robert Hastings Nichols, of Auburn Theological Seminary, has been serving since 1928 as Secretary of the Committee on the Revision of the Book of Common Worship of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A., and in this capacity is in charge of the printing of the Book, which is to be issued in the spring of this year. By appointment of the Synod of New York, of which he is Stated Clerk, he is writing a history of Presbyterianism within the bounds of the Synod, in connection with the Synod's celebration of its semi-centennial in October, 1932.

Professor Harold H. Schaff, of the History Department of Syracuse University, spent the summer in research in Germany, especially in Marburg, Weimar, and Dresden.

Herbert Wallace Schneider, Professor of Religion in Columbia University, is now on a leave of absence, studying certain religious groups in California and gathering materials for future research in the history of American religion. He is particularly concerned with several American mystics and their efforts to establish religious communities.

Professor Preserved Smith, of Cornell University, has been working on the second volume of his *History of Modern Culture*.

Professor Matthew Spinka, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, devoted his summer vacation to a research in the history of the Balkan Christianity, visiting Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Turkey, and Greece. He had interviews with Patriarchs Photius and Mesrob of Constantinople, Metropolitan Stefan of Sofia, and Archbishop Chrysostom of Athens.

Dean Henry B. Washburn, of the Episcopal Theological School of Cambridge, has published during the last year a volume on *Men of Conviction* and another on *Religious Motive in Philanthropy*.

Professor Abdel Ross Wentz, of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, is preparing a revised and enlarged edition of his recent volume on the *Lutheran Church in American History*, which is expected to be published during the summer. He has been asked to become Editor-in-chief of an enlarged edition of *The Lutheran Encyclopaedia*.

IN MEMORIAM

JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, 1857—1931.

The cause of Church History in America has suffered a real loss in the death of Professor John Alfred Faulkner, since 1897 Professor of Church History at Drew Theological Seminary. Professor Faulkner was born at Grand Pré, Nova Scotia, July 14, 1857, and died at Madison, New Jersey, September 6, 1931. He was educated at Acadia College (A. B., 1878; A. M., 1890; D. D., 1902), and at Drew Theological Seminary (B. D., 1881), Andover Theological Seminary, and at the Universities of Leipzig and Bonn. He began his ministry in the Methodist Episcopal Church in Pennsylvania in 1883, and soon achieved a reputation for his studiousness, and began at once to send articles to the church periodicals, especially on church history subjects. In 1897 he was chosen Professor of Church History at Drew Theological Seminary, succeeding Professor George R. Crooks. While still a student, he contributed numerous articles to *McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia* and during these early years wrote practically the entire first volume of Hurst's *History of the Christian Church*. Other books by Professor Faulkner are: *The Methodists*, 1903, (*Story of the Churches Series*) ; *Cyprian the Churchman*, 1906; *Erasmus the Scholar*, 1907; *On the Value of Church History*, 1920; *Modernism and the Christian Faith*, 1921; his last volume, *Burning Questions in Historic Christianity*, was published in 1930. Besides the numerous volumes to his credit, he was a voluminous writer for periodicals, discussing many subjects with clarity and learning.

Professor Faulkner was a defender of the older theological positions, but in his controversial writing he was always fair and kindly, and there was not a trace of bitterness in his make-up. He was a prodigious student and during his life-time collected a private library of great value. All of his students felt the impact of his simple and kindly nature. He was never self-seeking; he craved no office or distinction and "was completely satisfied if he could have books and the leisure to study them".

For many years Professor Faulkner took a prominent part in the affairs of the American Society of Church History, and in 1916 served as its President.

W. W. Sweet.

EDMUND LYMAN HOOD, 1858—1931

Born in Ravenna, Ohio, on August 18, 1858, Dr. Hood graduated from the University of Minnesota in 1880, and from the Yale Divinity School in 1885. He spent a year in study in Europe, and during it married at Oxford Jessie Raymond, of Cleveland, who died in 1922. Returning to America he became superintendent of Congregational home missions in the southwest. After eight years of this service, he took further study at the University of California and at New York University, which gave him the degree of Ph. D. in 1899. For fourteen years from 1905 he was president of Atlanta Theological Seminary and professor of church history. The years from 1919 to 1924 he spent as pastor of the Congregational

church of River Edge, N. J. During this time he was a regular and enthusiastic attendant at the meetings of the Society of Church History. In 1924 he went to Honolulu to be professor in Honolulu Theological Seminary and the University of Hawaii. He was married in 1925 to Margaret Evans of Toronto. His last four years were spent in the United States, partly at Roseland, La., and he died on August 14, 1931. He published *Pedagogy in the Middle Ages* (1898), *History of the National Council of Congregational Churches* (1901), *History of the Greek Russian Church in America* (1902), *History of the New West Education Commission* (1905).

RICHARD JOSEPH COOKE, 1853—1931

Bishop Cooke was born in New York City on January 31, 1853, and entered the Methodist ministry in 1873. He graduated from East Tennessee Wesleyan University in 1880. His next nine years were spent in the pastorate, in study at Berlin and in European travel. In 1889 he became professor of New Testament exegesis and historical theology at Chattanooga University. He was editor of the Methodist Advocate Journal from 1891 and book editor of the Methodist Episcopal Church from 1904. All these activities ended in 1912, when he was elected bishop. In this office he resided at Helena, Mont., and Portland, Ore. He was a member of many important general committees of his church, and prominently concerned with various parts of its work. For reasons of health he retired from the episcopate in 1920. In his later years he lived at Athens, Tenn., where he died on Christmas Day, 1931. He was married in 1881 to Eliza Gettys Fisher of Athens, who died in 1904, and in 1908 to Ella B. Fisher of the same place. Among his many books were *The Historic Episcopate* (1896), *History of the Ritual of the M. E. Church* (1900), *The Church and World Peace*, *Religion in Russia under the Soviets*.

LOUISE HORTENSE SNOWDEN, 1865—1931

Dean Snowden graduated as Bachelor of Science from the University of Pennsylvania in 1898. She was instructor in medieval history in Wellesley College, and subsequently dean of women at the University of Pennsylvania, holding this office for seven years. Early in the World War she became a welfare worker with the French troops, and for her services was made an honorary lieutenant in the French army. When the United States entered the war she did similar work with the American forces. After her retirement from her office in the University of Pennsylvania she lived in Philadelphia, where she died on June 8, 1931.

BOOK REVIEWS

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL GUIDE TO THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY

Compiled by S. J. CASE, J. T. MCNEILL, W. W. SWEET, W. PAUCK, M. SPINKA. Edited by S. J. CASE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931. viii+265 pages. \$2.50.

It is particularly appropriate that this first issue of CHURCH HISTORY should contain a notice of a volume covering the bibliography of the whole field of Church History. This volume came from the press in September, 1931, and therefore represents the very latest study of the subject. It was compiled by a group of Chicago scholars whose leadership in their respective fields is generally recognized.

The purpose of the *Guide* is not to present an exhaustive bibliographical compilation but, as its name implies, to make a careful selection of representative titles in the several sections of the field. It is comprehensive but not expansive. "It is prepared for the use of students or teachers who desire suggestions as to the chief topics for study and the fundamental literature to use either in obtaining a general and well-proportioned survey of Christian history or in conducting more intensive research within any area chosen for detailed investigation."

The whole subject of Christian History is divided into nine parts chiefly geographical. Each part is treated in a separate chapter and carefully divided and subdivided. The 2512 titles listed in the volume are grouped in the subdivisions either chronologically or alphabetically. Each chapter, and in some chapters each topic, is opened with an explanatory introduction. This arrangement would make it possible to use the book as a basal text for a course of study on the whole subject. But it will probably be used more often to supplement some standard textbook or outline.

The first three chapters were prepared by the editor, S. J. Case, who is Professor of the History of Early Christianity and Chairman of the Department of Church History in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. Chapter I is titled "Introduction" and lists 42 titles dealing with historical method in general, various types of interpretation, then the method of Church History in particular, introductions, periodizing, and evaluation. Chapter II offers a critical survey of works that cover the whole field of Christian history, the outlines and manuals in the various languages, the dictionaries and encyclopedias, the bibliographies and periodicals, and then certain specific phases of Christianity whose history has been studied separately, such as organization, worship, doctrine, preaching, missions, social activity. This chapter embraces 259 titles. The third chapter presents 258 works dealing with various phases of "Christianity in the Roman Empire".

The history of Christianity in western Europe is divided chronologically by the Reformation and geographically by the English Channel. Chapter IV on "Christianity in Western Continental Europe to 1517" was prepared by J. T. McNeill, Professor of the History of European

Christianity in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. The chapter calls attention to 359 works of recent date, most of them with a note of evaluation or description. They are classified under the main topics of General, The Expansion of Christianity, Church Organization, Religious Life and Worship, Education, Learning, and Theology, and The Decline of the Medieval Church.

"Christianity in Western Europe since the Reformation" is the main topic of Chapter V, prepared by W. Pauck, Professor of Church History in the Chicago Theological Seminary (affiliated with the Divinity School of the University). This complicated field is organized about the Reformation, the Catholic Reformation, and then by centuries, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth. Of the 341 titles thirty-six are listed as "general" works on Modern Christianity or modern culture.

A special chapter is devoted to works dealing with the history of "Christianity in the British Isles". This was prepared by Professor McNeill. It embraces 296 titles skilfully classified in topics and sub-divisions.

The comprehensive character of the *Guide* is made specially manifest by Chapter VII. This deals with "The History of Eastern Christianity". It was compiled by M. Spinka, Librarian and Assistant Professor of the History of Eastern Christianity in the Chicago Theological Seminary. Eastern Christianity usually receives only incidental treatment in general works claiming to cover the whole field of Church History. But here we have a carefully selected list of 245 works dealing with the history of the Orthodox, Separated, Uniate, Roman Catholic and Protestant racial and national groups in Eastern Europe and adjoining parts of Asia and Africa. Special attention is given to works in English, French, and German, but there are some titles of books in Greek, Russian, and other Slavic languages.

The churches of North and South America are treated in Chapter VIII by W. W. Sweet, Professor of the History of American Christianity in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. Of the 423 works set down in the chapter, about 350 deal with the various periods and phases of Christianity in the United States. The organization of the materials here is suggestive and is calculated to enable the student to visualize the totality of the religious forces in the several periods of American history.

The final chapter is by Professor Case and covers "Christianity in Newer Fields". This also is a field that is too often overlooked by students. The chapter lists 289 works as sources of information concerning the history of the younger churches in India, China, and Japan, on the mission fields of Africa and in the islands of the Southern Pacific.

Though five hands collaborated in assembling and arranging the materials for the volume, each a specialist in his sphere, the finished product shows a unity of design and a fine balance of parts. The cross-references from one section to items in other sections obviate some of the difficulties of classification and will prove valuable to the users of the book. The comments that are appended to many of the titles will enable the student to estimate the type and significance of the items. Thus he will be grateful to learn that a book is "dependable", "a classic", "a widely used textbook", "scholarly and judicial", "the best", "the most complete", "the

most critical", "now becoming antiquated", "comprehensive and authoritative", and so forth.

There are no limitations of language. Works in English greatly predominate. But there are many titles in German, French and Latin, not a few in other Romance languages, in Dutch and Scandinavian tongues, and some in Greek and the Slavic languages.

The completeness of the index will prove useful in enabling the reader to locate topics and authors mentioned in the volume. But one could wish for a more complete table of contents, that would include not only the chapter headings but also the divisional grouping within each chapter together with sub-divisions and sub-topics.

The authors of this list of titles make no effort at exhaustiveness, but their work contains many references to more extensive bibliographies along special lines in other volumes. This makes it possible for those who use the *Guide* to enlarge almost indefinitely their acquaintance with any topic chosen for special research. There are frequent references also to general bibliographies. Concerning the *Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion*, edited by G. B. Smith and published in 1916, we learn that it is "out of print." As to Mode's *Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History*, 1921, we are told that it is "the most complete bibliography yet compiled". But there is no reference to anything that in scope and up-to-dateness and convenience can compare with the present volume.

Other specialists in Church History, apart from those who have collaborated in this volume, as they peruse this list will miss some of their favorites. In such a critical compilation, of course, the personal equation cannot be entirely eliminated. As in a collection of hymns, so in a large selection of volumes on any topic, no two persons or groups would agree entirely on the items to be included. But so comprehensive and well-balanced and so carefully selected is this list that it is the estimate of the undersigned that no thorough student of the field, if he were to undertake a compilation of such size, would displace more than five per cent of the works here presented. The editor and authors of the *Guide* have laid us all under a debt of obligation to them for this useful auxiliary in our work.

Books like this begin to become obsolete as soon as they are published. New treatises on some phase of the subject are constantly appearing. For that reason all teachers of Church History may hope that new editions of the *Guide* will be called for at frequent intervals. In the meantime we trust that the department of book reviews in this journal, CHURCH HISTORY, may serve as a constant supplement to the *Guide*.

Abdel Ross Wentz.

Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg.

KARL BARTH, PROPHET OF A NEW CHRISTIANITY?

By WILHELM PAUCK. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931. 228 pages. \$2.00.

In this admirable exposition and critique of Barth's religious thought, Professor Pauck raises the question whether the German theologian is the one who is to come to lead the modern world back to a healthy and

vital faith or whether it must wait for another. Pauck can raise the question because he finds in Barth what many who approach him from the point of view of yesterday's conflict between fundamentalism and liberalism can not see—the religion and theology of a time of disillusionment. He realizes that this disillusionment is not merely a phase of post-war thinking but a symptomatic element in an intellectual climate which began to change long before the war, and that Barth is not merely a post-war reactionary but the contemporary of Russell, Krutch, and Sinclair Lewis. He notes that the crisis of existence about which Barth speaks and which becomes the basis of his theology is not only the problem of a period in which international, economic, and moral crises abound, but the problem of all human existence confronted with the question of its meaning. Interpreting Barth sympathetically from this point of view, the author offers us the portrait of a prophet of a new Christianity, which—in distinction from liberalism—does not fight disillusionment but builds its castle of faith on the edge of the abyss of despair. The positive element in Barth's thought is found, then, in a religious philosophy which surveys the conflicts of life from the viewpoint of their transcendent synthesis, without seeking to minimize the conflict.

As Pauck proceeds from the Barth of the *Rocmerbrief* to the Barth of the *Dogmatik*, from the theology of crisis to the theology of the Word of God, he grows less sure of the prophetic character of his subject. He finds in him an unintelligible complexity of thought compounded of realism, idealism, Biblicalism, and ecclesiasticism. The prophet becomes an academic theologian who seeks to make the tradition of the church his own, and forces an "intolerable theological skeleton-dance" upon us; the contemporary becomes a scholastic or a voice out of the sixteenth century. Pauck succeeds in carrying his readers along to share his perplexity and his judgment that this is not THE prophet of a new Christianity, but a voice in the wilderness preparing the way for one who will go beyond and not behind Troeltsch, Harnack, Ritschl, and Schleiermacher.

One may raise the question whether the author's difficulty in explaining the dualistic element in Barth's thought is not due to a wrong approach. If one makes the theology of crisis the starting point, as Pauck does, one may explain the later conservatism, Biblicalism, and supernaturalism of Barth as the result of the growing responsibility of a revolutionary turned organizer or of the academic domestication of a prophet turned theologian. But Pauck offers the materials for a simpler and psychologically truer solution of the problem. What led Barth to his new theology seems to have been less the dilemma of modern man with a meaningless life on his hands than the dilemma of a liberal preacher with a futile sermon on his lips. What Barth craved was not meaning but authority. The theology of authority came first and the theology of crisis in the second place. Or, in other words, Barth may be explained as the contemporary of Fascism rather than as the contemporary of utilitarianism. At all events the theology of authority is quite as early in Barth's thinking as is the theology of crisis.

In making the principle of crisis primary in his exposition of Barth Pauck, like Tillich in Germany, serves the cause of theology better probably than Barth does. For as this book points out, unless modern the-

ology goes beyond Barth by refusing to go back with him he may do us more harm than good.

H. Richard Niebuhr.

The Yale Divinity School.

THE YOUTH OF ERASMUS

By ALBERT HYMA. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1930.
350 pages. \$3.00.

Only recently have historians discovered that in order to understand some of the leading figures of history, it is necessary to study their youth. Augustine's inner development until the time of his conversion is still a topic of wide interpretation. Luther studies have practically been revolutionized since research of the thoughts of the young Luther has begun. It is significant that another character, much unlike them but hardly less significant, Erasmus of Rotterdam, has not yet been adequately understood. There too the cause is probably lack of research in his early development.

An important advance in this direction was made by Paul Mestwerdt in his profound and learned book, *Die Anfänge des Erasmus: Humanismus und Devotio moderna* (Leipzig, 1917). He showed for the first time the great indebtedness of Erasmus to the piety of the Brethren of the Common Life, and he proved that the fundamental problem presented by Erasmus' personality and teaching was the relationship between the Christian religiousness of the *Devotio moderna* and the humanistic education of the Italian Renaissance, the togetherness of Thomas à Kempis and Laurentius Valla.

The volume under review is a highly welcome contribution to this study of the beginnings of Erasmus. Hyma, who has made a name for himself by his book on *The Christian Renaissance: A History of the 'Devotio moderna'* (New York, 1925), could be expected to illuminate many of the still dark parts in the background of Erasmus.

He presents a careful study of the Dutch setting of Erasmus' early life and a full discussion of the few facts that have been preserved about it. And he adds to it all a reprint of what seems to be the earliest extant copy of the *Antibarbarorum Liber*, the writing of which Erasmus began while a monk at Steyn (probably 1489) and which he completed in 1494, while in the service of the bishop of Cambrai, but which he did not publish until 1520.

In judging the merits of Hyma's new book, one must first of all be grateful for the full picture of the life in fifteenth century Holland that he has drawn. The *milieu* of the towns of Rotterdam, Gouda, Utrecht, Deventer, 's Hertogenbusch, and of the monastery at Steyn is beautifully brought out, and his earlier studies in the Brethren serve Hyma well in developing this portrait.

But it must be stated with regret that he has made no progress in the solution of the fundamental problem of Erasmus' career. He feels it, to be sure, and once or twice he clearly states it, but he darkens the issue by some curious misjudgments seemingly caused by prejudices which are out of place in a historical study.

Such an attitude is indicated by Hyma's altogether too ready an ac-

ception of Mangan's often purely imaginary psychological interpretations of Erasmus' character. Even some of his ridiculous arguments as to the influence of the state of mind of Erasmus' mother while she carried her (second) illegitimate child in her womb upon her son's character are repeated. But the prejudices are clearly brought out when Hyma with some moralistic vengeance points to the lack of Erasmus' truthfulness, thus making a case for his unchristian sympathies. But particularly L. Valla has to feel the moralist's anger. From Hyma's total discussion, one derives the impression that the "typical humanist" (this term is occasionally used) was an immoral, pagan person, from whom no one could expect a Christian reform.

When one asks for a reason for this heat, he finds it in an overestimation of the piety of the *devotio moderna*, which is credited with a return to the simple faith and life of the apostles and the "lowly Jesus" and is even given the honor of having attempted a reform of the church in this sense.

There can be no doubt that this picture is distorted. It cannot be said with justice that the Italian humanists in general, and Valla in particular, were immoral and unchristian, unfit for an understanding of original Christianity, nor can it be claimed for the Brethren of the Common Life that they retrieved an understanding of the pure original Christian religion.

All this now is significant in respect to Hyma's interpretation of Erasmus' development. For his not clearly outlined thesis is that Erasmus owed his enthusiasm for apostolic Christianity and his critical attitude toward the medieval scholastic Christianity to the Brethren, and not to Colet, as since Seeböhm it has been the fashion to say, and that his Christian humanism was really a continuation of that of the *devotio moderna* (Hegius, Agricola, Gansfort). But this thesis is difficult to prove—and Hyma never does prove it, I think—not only because already in his youth Erasmus grew partly beyond the piety and humanism of the Brethren (*Antibarbarorum Liber*), but also because Erasmus, throughout his life disclaiming a decisive influence of the Brethren upon himself, consciously continued the work of the Italian (Christian) humanists. Hyma's defense is that Erasmus had reasons for being untruthful about his debt to the Brethren, and that when at Steyn, he renounced for a time the ideals of his early schooling, beginning to devote himself to the entirely secular ideals of the humanistic learning of the Italian Renaissance. But such an interpretation is again possible only by denying, in the first place, that Erasmus ever was a sincere monk, and, furthermore, by suggesting that he betrayed monastic loyalties when, in the monastery, he wrote the book *De contemptu mundi*.

The difficulty of Hyma's thesis becomes finally apparent when in order to explain the certainly genuine Christian interest of the later Erasmus, he has to give credit to Colet for having reawakened in his friend the ideals of his youth. But then the problem of how Colet could do such a thing remains still to be answered—and Hyma does not give an answer.

It must, therefore, be concluded that Mestwerdt is still primarily to be consulted by all who deal with the Erasmus problem. He offers the very plausible theory that the young Erasmus already achieved a combination of the piety of the *devotio moderna* and of the criticism of clas-

sical humanism. With convincing reasoning he has shown that it was possible for Erasmus to write the book *De contemptu mundi* and *Anti-barbarorum Liber* without betraying his own ideals.

It seems that Hyma would have improved his book if he had studied Mestwerdt's work more carefully than he evidently has done.

W. Pauck.

The Chicago Theological Seminary.

RELIGION ON THE AMERICAN FRONTIER: THE BAPTISTS

Edited by W. W. SWEET. New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1931. 652 pages. \$5.00.

Only recently have historians been impressed by the influence the frontier has played in the making of American history; and more recently still have church historians been aware of its effect upon the history of Christianity in this country.

Now as we look back, we can readily see how the magnitude of the West, when once vaguely glimpsed, challenged the vision, courage and creative ability of statesmen of both nation and church. And the conquest of that West, the steady pushing back of the frontier, with its loneliness, its dread of foes without and within, its hardship and toil, and its final marvellous achievement left its irradicable mark upon the entire nation.

The history of that frontier is largely the history of the United States. And the material for the writing of that history, the contemporary records of the thoughts, beliefs, ideals, hopes and accomplishments of the people who wrought that conquest, lie buried in the little churches and court-houses of the early frontier settlements in Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, Illinois—the highways of the migrating thousands.

To gather and preserve these documents for the use, more especially, of the church historian, is the purpose of Professor W. W. Sweet of the University of Chicago. Under the general title, *Religion on the American Frontier*, a number of volumes is to be published, each presenting the materials of a particular denomination.

The first volume, that on the Baptists, has appeared. In Part I, five chapters, Professor Sweet tells the story of the rise of the Baptists from small beginnings in the latter part of the Colonial Period, their rapid growth in Virginia and their movement westward, originally to escape the "tyranny" of the established order. Democratically minded, they feared the development of associations, lest they should restrict the liberty of the local churches, opposed mission societies largely because they feared any semblance of autocracy, and opposed every form of slavery.

In Part II are given the documents from which such history may be written. Among these are records from the clerk's book of certain early churches. These form some of the most valuable sources, since here are preserved the attitudes and actions of the common people who seldom had voice in the larger association or convention. Here too are letters from church to church, private letters, diaries of ministers, minutes of associations and circulars of the same to the represented churches, and pronouncements on important public and social affairs.

Of course there are many valuable documents pertaining to this era and area which Dr. Sweet has not included in this volume. It would be

impossible to publish all that may be collected. A choice has to be made. And the author has evidently been discriminating in his selection. There are no duplications and yet all interests and concerns of churches and religious groups have been fairly well covered.

A large list of classified bibliography is appended and a comprehensive index is given.

The real value of the book is the realization from the study of such sources that creeds and doctrines arise from an effort on the part of a people to interpret and understand their environment and experiences and thus find peace and satisfaction.

R. E. E. Harkness.

Crozer Theological Seminary,
Chester, Pa.

RELIGION FOLLOWS THE FRONTIER: A HISTORY OF THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

By WINFRED ERNEST GARRISON. New York: Harper, 1931. xiv+317 pages. \$2.50.

The frontier furnished two diametrically opposite influences on religious organization; one was toward union of effort; the other in the direction of division. The vast spiritual needs of a new country tended to drive religious forces together, resulting in such organizations as the American Bible Society and the Plan of Union of 1801, between Congregationalists and Presbyterians. On the other hand the highly developed individualism of the frontier, together with the fact that the restraining influences of the older settled regions were far away, led to controversy and schism. The Disciples of Christ furnish examples of both types of influence. They began in an attempt to unite all the religious bodies on the frontier; eventually they became a separate *Church*, and developed a larger degree of individualism than is to be found in any other important religious body in America, yet possessing, at the same time, a keen denominational consciousness. Taking it all in all, no other American religious body furnishes a better medium for a study of the developing cultural and religious life of the frontier.

The task of writing a history of so loosely organized a body as the Disciples is one of great difficulty, from the fact that there are no official pronouncements or central organizations speaking for the entire body, as is true of the Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Methodists. Consequently the book is largely based on materials which had to be dug out of the files of the numerous independent or semi-independent Disciple periodicals. The *Christian Baptist* (1813-1829), and the *Millennial Harbinger* (1830-1870) furnished a large share of the materials for the early period, while the *Christian-Evangelist* and the *Christian Standard* were used most extensively for the latter. The legitimacy of such sources is made clear when it is understood that in no other denomination has the editorial chair been so influential, and no other position among the Disciples comes nearer being a throne of power. The reviewer, however, suggests that a larger use of sources somewhat nearer the actual work of individual churches and ministers might have resulted in giving a somewhat

clearer idea as to just how the Disciples became the largest indigenous American church.

The book is divided into three sections. Part I, dealing with background, discusses the European heritage, the religion of the frontier where the movement began, and the several leaders, whose more or less isolated movements were finally brought together to form the Disciples body. Part II carries the story to 1866. Here the Campbells, father and son, naturally occupy the center of the stage. It might be suggested that Barton W. Stone and the movement he inaugurated deserve a somewhat larger place than is here accorded them. In this period the Disciples became a full fledged *Church* with a highly developed denominational feeling. Part III—The Passing of the Frontier—in five chapters, emphasizes the development of educational and missionary interests, and the rapid expansion and growth, especially in the middle west, and the chief controversies which have gone on within the denomination.

The book is appropriately and beautifully dedicated to the author's father and mother, since his father, James Harvey Garrison, occupied for sixty years one of the "thrones of power" among the Disciples.

W. W. Sweet.

Divinity School of the University of Chicago.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN PEOPLE

By HENRY K. ROWE. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931. 534 pages. \$4.00.

Professor Rowe's title indicates the distinctive feature of his history, its purpose to emphasize the part which the Christian people have taken in the development of their religion. "At a time when religion is regarded as an integral part of human life, it is studied better through people than through institutions, for the people make the institutions." Underlying is something like Dean Mathews' conception of Christianity, "a continuous group movement of people possessed of a common loyalty to Jesus." Carrying out his purpose, Professor Rowe pays more attention to popular religion than do most of the books, which is a refreshing contrast, and gives less space to organization and theology. His description of the religious life of the people naturally varies in different periods according to the amount of material. Not much is done with this aspect of medieval Christianity. A good book in this particular field, Manning's *The People's Faith in the Time of Wyclif*, seems not to be known. After all, however, Professor Rowe's book does not show radical difference from the ordinary manner of treating church history. Indeed the results of his endeavor raise a question as to the soundness of the theory that the people make the religion, for he is obliged to assign the usual predominant importance to great teachers and leaders.

Professor Rowe's book "is intended primarily for students". It is not an impressionistic popular sketch like *Since Calvary*. In view of its intention, it must be judged by its accuracy. The location of Aquinas "in the tenth century" (p. 203) is a slip, but mistakes in fact, some of them in important matters, are too many for a book for students. Concerning the papal elections decree of Nicholas II (p. 183) it is said that the cardinals were "priests and deacons", no mention being made of the

cardinal bishops, who were at first the electors, and that Leo IX made the cardinals "representative of all the countries of western Europe", which shows a misconception of the situation. Gregory VII, it is said, "insisted on the election of bishops by cathedral chapters" (p. 188). He did not urge this and it did not come until about a hundred years after his time. Luther did not "use the colloquial language of the people" (p. 252) in translating the Bible: "I speak according to the usage of the Saxon chancery, the form used by the German princes in addressing one another". The Protest of Speyer in 1529 was not signed by "Lutherans only" (p. 258), but also by Zwinglians. The statement that Pius IX "promulgated" "the deification of the Virgin Mary" (p. 465) is rather astonishing.

The book is somewhat uneven. The best parts—and they are good—are those dealing with the ancient church and the Reformation. The section on the medieval church shows less knowledge and sympathy. Eastern Christianity is rather meagerly treated. Professor Rowe essays the difficult task of organizing the modern history of Christianity in large part by providing chapters on aspects of the subject matter such as "Education and Reform" and "Liberalizing Theology". As wholes, these emphasize significant features, and they make this part of the book illuminating for contemporary conditions. But their contents are so miscellaneous and so lacking in indications of date that not much sense of development results. Roman Catholicism since 1600 gets about a tenth of the space given to Protestantism, which distorts the picture. American affairs receive a disproportionate amount of consideration.

Professor Rowe has the great merits of impartiality and broad sympathies. He writes with insight about diverse religious manifestations. Except for the faults of proportion which have been mentioned, his judgments and interpretations are generally sound. His heart is in his subject, and his narrative goes on with sustained alertness and enthusiasm. It is an interesting book, and stands high among the one volume church histories.

Robert Hastings Nichols.

Auburn Theological Seminary.

A HISTORY OF THE POPES

By F. HAYWARD. Translated from the French by Monks of St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1931. xvii+405 pages. \$5.00.

Many works, long and short, have been written on the Papacy, but few on the popes. This book attempts to present the significant data on each of the two hundred and sixty popes of history. Inevitably the result is a chronicle rather than a history. The introduction by Abbot Butler does little more than epitomize the book; but the English historian takes the opportunity to dissent from the French author's too favorable judgment of Innocent III's policies. Hayward's information is adequate, but he exhibits no great range of historic interest, and some of his omissions are surprising. His position is that of a fair-minded but carefully orthodox Roman Catholic. Throughout the work rather free use is made of quotations from modern writers, especially from Abbé Mourret's *Histoire de l'église*.

Having treated at some length the evidence for St. Peter's presence and work in Rome, the author comes easily to the sweeping conclusion: "Thus the prerogatives of the Church of Rome are seen to rest on an immovable foundation." This assumption does not place the popes beyond criticism; not a few of them indeed come in for sharp condemnation. Where the data are indecisive, however, the pope in question usually gets the benefit of the doubt. In some instances the criticism made involves matters that the Decree of Infallibility might be supposed to cover; for example, Pope Honorius I, making a decision on the Monothelite controversy, is said to have "had no conception of the seriousness of the issue at stake". On the other hand, although he holds with Mourret that the conduct of John XII was "the most monstrous of scandals", he is happy to add that from the standpoint of orthodoxy "his bulls were irreproachable". The Schism of 1054 is explained on the ground of Michael Cerularius' arrogance. Hildebrand is quite a hero to the author. Of John XXII's heresy of the Sleep of the Blessed he says: "An expression escaped the lips of the pope in a sermon which greatly scandalized the world and tarnished his reputation as a theologian." This pope's treatment of the Spiritual Franciscans is not noticed. Martin V is praised for his aggressive policy, and the Renaissance popes are charitably judged. The charges against Innocent VIII's morality after taking orders are held unproved; he "died an edifying death". Alexander VI perforce comes off rather worse; but "in purely religious matters" he "did nothing and published no document which could in any way deserve censure". Savonarola is treated unsympathetically: Luther is "fiery, proud and violent", and Leo X too indifferent to meet the crisis of the time. The condemnation of Galileo is held to have weakened the status of the papacy in the era of the Thirty Years' War. Innocent XII is credited with giving the death-blow to papal nepotism in 1692. The suppression of the Jesuits, forced by political necessity upon Clement XIV, is regarded as having conduced to the French Revolution. The nineteenth and twentieth century popes are treated with peculiar sympathy and respect.

On the whole the book fulfils its purpose; but probably many even of those who share the author's viewpoint will find it mediocre. Abbot Cuthbert writes the Introduction without having seen the translation, but expresses full faith in the translators. The reviewer is at the greater disadvantage of not having seen the original. But it is safe to assume that the French writer did not write Noirmoutier for Marmoutier (p. 54), or repeatedly call the historian Halphen, "Helpen" (pp. 131f.). By an inadvertence, Butler dates the death of Boniface VIII in the year 1300. If he had not fought on for three years more, how much of modern history would never have been enacted!

John T. McNeill.

Divinity School of the University of Chicago.

THE INQUISITION

By A. HYATT VERRILL. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1931.
353 pages. \$3.00.

This book is an attempt to treat the Inquisition in a manner so intimate and vivid that the non-academic reader will find his way made easy.

Considerable sections of the book show something of the sensational interest of an assemblage of front page crime stories. But the author rightly aims to lead the reader behind the innumerable lurid horrors which he recites to the motives of those charged with responsibility for the suppression of error. He sees in the demoralization and confusion of belief that prevailed in the twelfth century the necessity for a general disciplinary agency. There appeared no means of combatting the brood of sects, heresies, and superstitions, until the Dominicans and Franciscans came upon the scene, and made themselves the willing agents of the Papal Inquisition. The Inquisition was an adaptation of the methods of repression long in use by secular governments, rather than an original device of the Church. Death by burning was already inflicted by the secular powers for numerous offences; hence the sinister significance of "handing over to the secular arm". The practice of torture to secure confessions, at first restricted by the Papacy, got beyond control when Alexander IV in 1256 authorized inquisitors to absolve one another. In a chapter on "Superstition, Sorcery, and Witchcraft" Mr. Verrill indicates the extent to which these were the objects of attack by the Inquisition, and how ineffectual was the attempt to suppress these practices, while the inquisitors themselves believed in their efficacy.

The book will help toward the popular realization of the fact that the faults of the Inquisition were not wholly due to the faults of the Church. The author shows, indeed a good deal of consideration for the official Church. His attitude to the Spanish Inquisition is that of an apologist. He holds that only three persons were put to death for Lutheranism in Spain,—two Englishmen and one Frenchman. This is strange in view of the explicit statements of Llorente, who, while he gives the impression that the number of Lutherans was relatively small, yet records scores of Spanish names of persons who suffered as "Lutherans" or "impenitent Lutherans". His chapter on "the history of two autos-da-fe-celebrated against the Lutherans in the City of Seville" includes in a long catalogue of Lutheran victims the Englishmen and Frenchman referred to by Mr. Verrill. He later says that from the date of the second of these holocausts, 1560, to 1570, some Lutheran heretics were condemned every year, and holds that "all Spain would have been infected with the heresy but for the extreme severity shown toward the Lutherans". All this Mr. Verrill consigns to oblivion. Nor does he tell us on what grounds he is led to believe that Protestants "have far exceeded the Inquisition in fiendish tortures and inhumanities". A passage from Pseudo-Augustine which is copied by Regino of Prüm and Burchard of Worms, and by them erroneously attributed to the Council of Ancyra, A. D. 314 (spelled in that period "Concilium Anquirense") is quoted as from a ninth century "council of Anquia". There are numerous defects and misleading statements; but the impressions that will be formed by those who have time only for impressions will nevertheless on the whole not be wide of the mark. Such readers will probably shed some prejudices in the perusal of the book, and reach the sound conclusion that in the process of man's advance by trial and error, sooner or later the system of inquisitorial repression was bound to be given a trial,—and that it is highly undesirable to try it again.

John T. McNeill.

The Divinity School, University of Chicago.

MARTIN BUCER

By HASTINGS ELLS. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931. xii+539 pages. \$5.00.

Those who are familiar with the history of the Reformation in the southern states of the Holy Roman Empire have long wished for an adequate account of Bucer's life and works. It is gratifying to observe that American scholarship has in a large measure resulted in the presentation of such an account, for the biography by Professor Eells supplies us with a large body of facts which have been ably organized into a readable story. Although the book abounds in colloquial phrases, some of which are likely to offend a certain group of fastidious readers, it has the advantage of being very clear and devoid of verbiage.

The author divides the history of Bucer's life into forty chapters, of which the first is devoted to his youth—a period of thirty years (1491-1521). It must seem a little surprising that only 9 pages out of 422 were deemed sufficient by Eells to acquaint us with the early environment of Bucer and with the formative period in his life. The sources, it is true, do not throw much light on these subjects, but one should at least attempt to learn a little more about Bucer's teachers and the friends of his youth. Furthermore, the genesis of Bucer's view on the eucharist, though more fully treated elsewhere by the same author, has not been given proper emphasis here. Eells does not appear to have consulted as thoroughly as he should the labors of Honius (Hoen), else he would have noted or have informed the reader that the Christian name of this interesting scholar was not Christopher (p. 72), but Cornelius.

The small defects in the book are, however, insignificant when compared with the valuable contributions made by the author. It may not be correct to say that Bucer was "a theologian, unsurpassed in Europe for his erudition" (p. 50), but all students of the Reformation are greatly indebted to Professor Eells for having filled a serious gap in the history of that subject. Bucer does not as a rule receive sufficient credit for the role played by him in the development of the Reformation. Zwingli has long been accorded a much greater place; nevertheless in some respects he was of lesser importance than Bucer. Calvin, also, has won far more renown than Bucer, and for very just reasons. He was, however, Bucer's pupil and follower (pp. 232-237). In this connection it should be noted that the Reformation in Strassburg, though less spectacular than that in Geneva, was of far greater consequence than has been commonly assumed. This wealthy imperial city was for many years the seat of important developments in the realms of ecclesiastical reform and modern education. John Sturm's gymnasium and Martin Bucer's church provided Geneva with numerous elements of seemingly miraculous success. It is partly because of these facts that the work of Professor Eells acquires added value. He has devoted great pains and industry to his task, and he has supplied at the end of his story an excellent bibliography and copious notes. The index also is deserving of the highest praise.

Albert Hyma.

University of Michigan.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Bagnani, Gilbert: *Rome and Papacy*
New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1929
- Dearmer, Percy: *Everyman's History of the Prayer Book*
Milwaukee, Morehouse Publishing Co., 1931
- Hutchinson, Paul: *The Spread of Christianity*
New York, The Abingdon Press, c1922
- Kastein, Josef: *The Messiah of Ismir*
New York, The Viking Press, 1931
- Laux, John: *Church History, A Complete History of the Catholic Church
to the Present Day*
New York, Benziger Brothers, 1931
- McConnell, S. D.: *History of the American Episcopal Church, 11th
edition*
Milwaukee, Morehouse Publishing Co., 1916
- Nagler, A. W.: *The Church in History*
New York, The Abingdon Press, 1929
- Rudwin, Maximilian: *The Devil in Legend and Literature*
Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Co., 1931
- Schermerhorn, William D.: *Beginnings of the Christian Church*
New York, Methodist Book Concern, 1929
- Wand, J. W. C.: *A History of the Modern Church*
New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1929